DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 724 SP 029 837

AUTHOR Sears, James T.; And Others
TITLE The Political Economy of Teacher Training: Attracting High-Ability Persons into Teaching. A Critique.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 91p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Miami Beach, FL, February 24-27, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; *Educational Economics; *Educational Policy; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Costs; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Employment; *Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program

ABSTRACT

Based upon a longitudinal, ethnographic study of a teacher education reform program, this paper examines the social context of, and explores the political implications for, policies and programs designed to recruit, train, and retain high-ability persons in the teaching profession. Through the economic metaphor of investment securities, this paper critically examines the adequacy of such policies and programs. Specifically, this paper examines the policy implications for schools and colleges of teacher education which borrow from the experience of the world of business and investments to attract high-ability people into teaching. In the process, educational research on the ability of teacher education students and reform programs implemented to recruit, train and retain such persons will be reviewed, and data collected from one case study of a teacher education program (the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program) adopting this model will be discussed. Endnotes and reading references are included. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290724

The political economy of teacher training: Attracting high-ability persons into teaching, a critique

James T. Sears, Ph.D.
Educational Leadership & Policies
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

John D. Marshall, Ph.D.
Curriculum & Instruction
National College of Education
Evanston, IL 60201

Amy Otis-Wilborn, Ph.D.
Exceptional Education
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Thomas B. Horton, Ph.D cand.
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Paper Presented at the
Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association
February 1988

The authors thank Dennis Carlson and William Pink for their critical comments of an earlier draft of this paper.

SP 029 837

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. D. Marshall
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ABSTRACT

Based upon a longitudinal, ethnographic study of a teacher education reform program, this paper examines the social context of, and explores the political implications for, policies and programs designed to recruit, train and retain high-ability persons in the teaching profession. Through the economic metaphor of investment securities, this paper critically examines the adequacy of such policies and programs. Specifically, this paper examines the policy implications for schools and colleges of teacher education which borrow from the experience of the world of business and investments to attract high-ability people into teaching. In the process, educational research on the ability of teacher education students and reform programs implemented to recruit, train and retain such persons will be reviewed, and data collected from one case study of a teacher education program adopting this model will be discussed.

Introduction

> There is no stated examination of teachers. Many are declared to be incompetent. . . .[There is] no central supervisor for whom the character and qualification of the instruction may be certified by society at large.
>
> A Nineteenth century former teacher (Knight & Hall, 1951:346)

> On the one hand, too many classrooms are burdened with teachers improperly prepared for their work. On the other hand, thousands of competent instructors are being lured from their jobs by more rewarding work elsewhere.
>
> U.S. News and World Report (1983:37)

There is a crisis of confidence in teacher training. Today, as was the case a generation or even a century ago, the competency of teachers has been seriously questioned. The public image of departments and colleges of teacher education is poor; graduates of these programs are believed to be lacking in commitment to teaching and devoid of intellectual abilities. Tales of teachers incapable of performing simple mathematical computations or communication through the written word abound. Many envision only the least motivated and poorly skilled college students entering schools of education. The dismal performance of elementary and secondary students on standardized tests as well as their lack of technical and instructional classroom abilities has been greeted by many policy makers and teacher educators with alarm. Educational policies and reform programs have been instituted under the premise that attracting high-ability persons into teaching is critical for the improvement of educational quality and the enhancement of the teaching profession.

As will be discussed in this section, there is little data to support this premise. This section begins with a review of educational research about teachers' academic abilities and then reviews research explicating the relationship between student academic ability and teacher

effectiveness. This section concludes with a review of recent reforms designed to recruit, prepare, and induct more competent persons into teaching.

Teachers' Academic Abilities

One of the greatest concerns among the public and the most widely researched areas within teacher education is the academic ability of teachers entering into the nation's schools. Teacher education graduates of the early 1980s, particularly those most interested in teaching as a career, are generally less academically talented than those who graduated a decade earlier (Pigge, 1985). Between 1973 and 1982 the decline in the SAT, ACT, GRE and NTE scores of prospective education majors fell more rapidly that those scores for students intending to pursue other areas of study (FN1). A more recent study of teacher education graduates at a midwestern university from 1982-1985 revealed that while these graduates were significantly inferior to non-teacher graduates on all ACT scores, they had significantly higher cumulative GPAs (Barger, Barger & Reardon, 1986). Academic ability, too, is inversely related to the probability that a student will continue as an education major through graduation (Bethune, 1981).

There are several considerations that should temper one's interpretations of these claims. First, these data, largely gleaned from SAT and ACT scores, are gathered from college-bound seniors who declared an intention to major in education. The use of these data to infer the academic quality of the teacher workforce, however, is questionable. The vast majority (80%) of high school seniors who note their intention to major in education never follow through with their original plans (Nelson, 1985). Moreover, between one-quarter and one-half of those students who

receive certification will not enter the classroom (FN2). Finally, a great proportion (50-75 percent) of teachers who, as high school students, had not indicated education as a likely major wound up, as college graduates, teaching (FN3).

Second, little attention is given to the range of these scores; there has been an over-reliance on the reporting of mean scores (Getzels & Jackson, 1963). More than ten percent of those college graduates who scored high on the verbal and math measures of the SAT entered teacher education programs (Vance & Schlechty, 1982), and the majority of these students joined the workforce as classroom teachers. Citing these and other data, a lengthy review of current research on teacher education (Lanier & Little, 1986:539) asserts:

> Teacher education does not fail to attract and retain persons with high ability. If there is a failure, it is that teaching does not get as many as might be hoped from the highest scoring test takers, but it does attract and retain many bright people. Actually, the failure that is supported by data. . .is that too many persons with excessively low scores on academic measures are allowed into teaching. . .

Third, during the past half-century, a multitude of conferences, committees, surveys, symposia, monographs, studies, surveys, and reports have addressed teacher training (FN4). Little research, however, has been directed at understanding what goes on within the institutional "black box" of teacher training (FN5). Most research has focused on the quality of individuals entering teacher training institutions rather than on the nature of those institutions, the status of the teaching profession, or the relationship of the program content to "teacher quality."

The concern about quality teachers, however, has rarely been discussed from these perspectives. Many educational researchers and teacher educators conclude that "the teaching profession is attracting and

retaining fewer academically able young people" (Darling-Hammond, 1984:2), and the public, in the most recent Gallup Poll (Gallup & Clark, 1987), cites the "difficulty in getting good teachers" as the fourth most pressing concern confronting public schools. This image of incompetent individuals entering teaching has become so pervasive that some institutions have marketed themselves as "quality assurance programs" warranting their graduates to prospective school districts (FN6).

Within this discussion, student academic competence is most commonly associated with the quality of teacher education students (FN7). While a wide variety of criteria has been used to select prospective teachers (FN8), the most widely used and researched criteria for admittance into the profession of teaching are academic performance and ability (FN9). A recent survey of 66 teacher education institutions throughout the country, for example, found that each had established a minimum cumulative GPA for admission. The average expected GPA was 2.25 (out of 4.0); almost half (42%) of these institutions required students to maintain GPAs of 2.5 or better in professional education courses in order to graduate (Ishler, 1984). However, as Geraldine Brownlee (1985:53) observed, "when grade inflation is accounted for, GPA increases must be discredited."

While a trend toward raising GPA as a criterion for admission has been noted in several studies, one survey of 121 teacher education institutions revealed that, in the vast majority of institutions, only a handful of students failed to meet this criterion. Additionally, those who failed reapplied and were admitted when the GPA requirement was removed (Laman & Reeves, 1983).

Preservice teachers, according to some researchers (FN10), do not compare favorably in academic terms with college students majoring in other fields. Other researchers (FN11), however, have disputed this claim.

Whether, in fact, there are significant differences in academic performance or ability between education and non-education majors is clearly debatable. Less arguable, however, is that many academically talented women who have traditionally entered the teaching force have chosen other career paths and that the least academically able persons remain in teaching (Feistritzer, 1984). Women whose high school grades are higher, whose academic degree intentions are higher, and whose post-college graduate marriage intentions are less immediate are more likely to enter what, historically, have been non-traditional career fields for them (Sullivan, 1981).

Of those persons, male and female, who do enter the classroom, a startling proportion (two-thirds) expect to leave within five years (Mason, 1966). Teachers in the upper 20 percent of measured verbal ability are three-times less likely to intend to teach at age 30 than those with the lowest verbal ability (Vance & Schlechty, 1982). These expectations are borne out by teachers' actions: 40 percent leave the profession within just a few years (FN12), and those who remain in teaching are less academically able than those who leave the profession (FN13). In a recent analysis of three groups of college students with teaching certificates, David Chapman (1984), however, found that the quality of a person's first year teaching experience is more strongly related to teacher attrition (within five years) than either their academic performance or their perceived adequacy of their training program.

Equally evident is the common image constructed by <u>both</u> teacher education students and education professors of a "typical" education major: a person who "makes the grade" but who rarely exerts herself, preferring instead to engage in campus social life (Sears, 1987). This image of education as an "easy major" generally has been attributed to the caliber of entering education students and the ensuing lack of rigor in their professional program.

Academic Ability and Teaching Effectiveness

While academic ability and performance are not the only factors in the formula for an "effective teacher," since Boyce's (1912) early studies, most teacher educators consider them necessary preconditions or, at minimum, characteristics that do not put teachers at a disadvantage in the classroom (FN14). Summarizing research on effective teachers, Jere Brophy (1982:529) echoes this commonplace belief when he concludes, "Effective teachers. . . .are probably brighter and more dedicated than average." (emphasis added)

Data supporting Brophy's contention are certainly ambivalent (FN15). For example, in comparing grades earned in preservice teacher education courses, no significant relationships between that variable and chances for employment, job satisfaction, or longevity in the teaching profession were found (FN16). These data contradict those reported elsewhere (FN17).

Moderate, positive correlations (ranging from .43 to .52) have been found between objective measures of classroom competencies of student teachers and their NTE scores (Piper & O'Sullivan, 1981), their cognitive levels (Tiller, 1981), and grade-point averages (Jones, 1956). Analysis of the Coleman data also has found positive relationships between teachers' verbal abilities and student achievement (Hanushek, 1972; Bowles, 1970). However, these research findings are the exception rather than the rule.

After four years of teaching, other researchers (FN18) report principal ratings of teachers' success in teaching and student academic performance to be inversely related to both general education and over-all college grade-point averages. That is, the higher principal assessment of teacher success and the better student performance, the lower

the teacher's college academic average. Moreover, in a study conducted by Thacker (1964), neither scores on the NTE, teacher academic averages, nor supervisors' ratings were predictive of principals' estimates of their teachers' classroom performance. These studies are reflective of a larger body of research which has found no significant relationship between teachers' intellectual performance (e.g., strong collegiate academic performance, high scores on college aptitude or individual standardized achievement tests) and teaching success (e.g., principal ratings) (FN19).

Part of the problem in the lack of consensus among research studies is conceptual: what does one mean by "bright students" and how does one define "success in teaching?" Another factor contributing to conflicting conclusions is methodological: how does one measure these two concepts? For some researchers "bright students" are conceptualized as evidencing superior academic knowledge (Villeme & Hall, 1980), verbal ability (Nelson, 1985), and cognitive development (Tiller, 1981). Measurement of "brightness" ranges widely: NTE scores (Piper & O'Sullivan, 1981); overall college grade-point averages (Maguire, 1966); non-education grade-point averages and participation in an honors program (Siegel, 1969); verbal understanding (Ryans, 1960); pre-teacher training interviews (Baker, 1970); ideational fluency (Guilford, 1959); professional recommendations (Perry, 1981); self-reports (Ryans, 1960); and Piagetian cognitive level (Tiller, 1981). Similarly, the conceptualizations and measurement of "success in teaching" are equally diverse and problematic: longevity in the profession (Villeme & Hall, 1980); job satisfaction (Villeme & Hall, 1980); classroom competencies (Piper & O'Sullivan, 1981); and pupil achievement (Shim, 1965) have all been called into service.

All of these data challenge Brophy's (1982:529) statement that "effective teachers. . . .are probably brighter and more dedicated than

average" and lend credence to the conclusion of Phillip Schlechty and Victor Vance (1983:101): "We are aware that no convincing evidence links measures of academic ability to teacher effectiveness." This conclusion has also been reached by other researchers who have systematically reviewed this literature (FN20). Of course, even if substantial data were marshaled to demonstrate a relationship between persons' academic abilities and their success in the classroom, the equation of quality teaching and student learning with quantitative measures should be questioned (Marshall, Sears, & Otis-Wilborn, 1987).

Reform Proposals to Develop Competencies and Enhance Teacher Quality

> We beg of you as far as you can, to send us candidates for admission to the Normal School, who possess (1) purity and strength of moral and religious character, (2) good health, (3) good manners, (4) love of children, (5) a competent share of talent and information, (6) a native tact and talent for teaching and governing others, (7) a love for the occupations of the schoolroom, (8) the common-school spirit, a martyr spirit, (9) and some experience in teaching.
>
> Henry Barnard, principal — circa 1848 (Harper, 1939:53)

> If the selection of trainees be properly made, the advanced academic education provided for prospective teachers can consist entirely of cultural materials, especially selected and communicated, to promote mellow wisdom, imaginative vision, and a driving educative zeal -- qualities sadly lacking in the average teacher today.
>
> George S. Counts (1935:7)

Grades and test scores account for less than three percent of the variance in teacher effectiveness (Denton, 1983) and data supporting the predicted relationship between undergraduate academic performance and teacher effectiveness are meager (FN21). Nevertheless, many reforms link academic ability and performance to teacher effectiveness and advocate policies and procedures designed to attract a more academically competent set of students into the profession (FN22).

"How can we," asked Seymour Fox (1984:224), "encourage the best and the brightest to serve in our schools?" Teacher education reformers have outlined and implemented a variety of strategies. Most of these can be categorized according to the three phases through which successful teacher education students pass.

Recruitment/Selection (Acclimation Phase). Only five percent of college freshmen in the 1980s express an interest in becoming teachers (Austin, 1983) and those individuals who demonstrate the greatest academic talent are the least likely to choose teaching as a career (FN23). The most popular professional fields for these academically talented high school students are technology and medicine (FN24). Nevertheless, a recent survey of a sample of academically talented high school seniors from schools throughout the Southeastern United States revealed that eight times as many students (25%) would seriously consider teaching as a career if certain preconditions (e.g., money, prestige, positive community attitudes) were satisfied (FN25).

Few teacher education institutions have an active recruitment program to attract academically talented persons into the teaching profession (Laman & Reeves, 1982). A variety of proposals, however, have been made. These include: full-tuition scholarships, alumni involvement, honors programs, introductory teaching courses at the senior high school level, teaching corps fellowships, and guaranteed employment (FN26).

Programs like the one at Bellarmine College in Louisville have designed and implemented courses introducing talented high school students to teaching and dispelling negative attitudes toward teachers and teaching (Howard & Goethals, 1985). Other schools, such as the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, have set enrollment limits for teacher education and established an admissions review board which evaluates applicants on

the basis of GPA, credit hours accumulated, NTE scores, and communication skills (Wisniewski, 1986). Despite these reform efforts, analysis of an earlier program initiated by Trenton College (New Jersey) revealed that talented students attracted to its program did not persist as well during their training period nor did they gain a consistently higher rating than those not participating in the experimental program (Reed, 1976).

Training (Specialization Phase). Some proponents of teacher education reform (FN26) have argued for a fifth year of study devoted to professional training. Using developmental theory as a curriculum basis, the master's degree program at LaSalle College's Department of Education exemplifies this approach (Clabaugh, Feden & Vogel, 1984).

Other reformers have sought to extend teacher training into a five year program of study. The extended teacher education program at the University of Kansas, for example, claimed that its now defunct program attracted students who were better academically qualified than those entering the school's "regular" teacher education program (Scannell, 1984).

Proposals to develop more rigorous training programs are often accompanied by calls for careful monitoring of students' progress, enacting more stringent licensing and certification procedures, and instituting a national proficiency examination (FN27).

Induction (Professionalization Phase). The induction phase of teacher preparation is nearing the point of a "full-blown fad" (Huling-Austin, 1986:2). Most induction programs share four generic goals: (1) to improve teaching performance, (2) to increase the retention of promising beginning teachers during the induction years, (3) to promote the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers, and (4) to satisfy mandated requirements related to induction and certification (Huling-Austin, 1986).

In a recent report on teacher induction, the Association of Teacher Educators found that "formal induction programs [at the local level] are not initiated on a large scale" (Kester & Marockie, 1987:26). However, more than 60 percent of the states are planning or piloting such programs (Hawk & Robards, 1987). While conventional notions about induction assistance have often taken the form of special inservice sessions and more frequent evaluations of the novice teacher (Brooks, 1987), alternative models are receiving more attention of late.

One of the more popular induction models pairs the beginning teacher with a "colleague teacher." Hilda Borko (1986) elaborates on this quasi-formal "buddy system" using a set of ideal characteristics for the colleague teacher developed by the Los Angeles Unified School District. Often called mentoring, this model is popular among reform enthusiasts and demands further and more wide-ranging study (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986). In some districts, mentor programs are tied into career ladder programs (Schlechty & Crowell, 1985) while others employ retired teachers (Sacks & Brady, 1985). However implemented, the model presents a variety of critical issues relating to responsibility, remuneration, purpose, and personnel that must eventually be acknowledged and resolved (Odell, 1987).

The induction process is not solely handled through mentoring. Novice teachers are sometimes assigned to district-level coordinators who oversee and assist the beginner's progress. Additionally, inductees are sometimes placed in teams of experienced teachers within the school building. District-wide teacher centers also make special efforts to socialize new teachers as do some colleges and universities (Borko, 1986). An example of the latter is the long standing induction program at the National College of Education which formally invites its teacher graduates to return to campus for informal, monthly seminars throughout their initial year.

Summary

"From the earliest decades of the nineteenth century, . . . Americans have disagreed among themselves about the qualities of good teachers and the best modes of nurturing those qualities" writes Lawrence Cremin (1965, vii). Historically speaking, present-day interest in such matters represents a momentarily boisterous uproar in an otherwise quiet, ongoing conversation among educators, policy makers, and the public-at-large regarding teacher education.

The information presented in this section, while neither new nor surprising to persons interested in the education of teachers, is intended to make three important points: First, that the relationship between academically talented or bright prospective teachers and successful or effective teaching is suggestive at best and problematic regardless of how one attempts to measure or understand it. Second, that such a relationship will continue to be debated until such time as our collective understanding and acceptance of terms such as "bright teachers" and "teacher effectiveness" become widely accepted and utilized. Meanwhile, we are faced with an ongoing controversy:

> There are those, I fear, who have always tended to regard such controversy with a vague sense of impropriety, holding that true professionals ought somehow to be able to resolve their differences through research instead of debate. I myself believe that continruing debate is at the heart of the matter. For as a society makes up its mind about the education of its teachers, it is really undertaking to define its own future. And while research can doubtless inform that enterprise, it can never replace the political process that is its essence.

Cremin's notice underscores the third point we make here: that many current reformers of teacher education have elected to forego the quality

teacher = quality teaching debate. Bypassing this controversy, numerous contemporary teacher education reforms are aimed at recruiting, preparing and retaining "high ability" people in teaching -- a praiseworthy idea to be sure, but an overly simplisitic one with its share of problems and complications. Public and political sentiments have pushed up to "stop talking and do something!" Why have we elected this action, and what are some of its consequences?

Our hope is that this paper will serve to resurrect what Cremin recognizes as the political process that is the essence of educational decisionmaking. Borrowing heavilty from the Frankfurt school of social thought and critical curriculum theory, we will argue, in the final section of this paper, that the support of these policies and programs can best be understood through an examination of their social roots in the economic sphere. Prior to developing this thesis, we will explicate the educational, political and economic assumptions underlying one particualr teacher education program -- The Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program. The next section of this paper describes this program and outlines the independent longitudinal ethnographic research study which we have conducted.

II The Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program:

A Teacher Education Reform Model

> Kids who are not bright — some of them will also make outstanding teachers. But, I don't think that this means we should not try to recruit bright people for teaching. I think that it is almost ludicrous to get into a debate about whether or not you have to be smart to be a good teacher. If the other qualities are present, the ability to work with children, then it has got to be a plus for the person to be bright and to be well educated.
>
> John Wright, Director of the Bridenthal Program

> We cannot improve the quality of education in our schools without improving the quality of teachers in them.
>
> Tomorrow's Teachers (1986:23)

As discussed in the previous section, little research supports the commonly held belief that "bright students" are more effective teachers than teachers who might best be described as "average students." This lack of a firm research base, however, has not prevented policy makers from advocating proposals to recruit, prepare and induct high-ability students into teaching, nor has it discouraged teacher educators from developing such programs. There has been no longitudinal, independent research conducted to evaluate such programs.

This section of the paper will provide an overview of one such program and briefly discuss the independent research study. A more complete portrait of this program and its participants will be drawn as the metaphor of securities investments is applied to critically analyze this reform model in section three of this paper.

Description of the Bridenthal Program

One of the most publicized reform efforts (FN28), rooted in the belief that talented people can make effective teachers and should be recruited into the profession, is the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program at

Calvin College. Calvin College (FN29) is a liberal arts college located in a major metropolitan area in the southwestern United States. Formerly a church-controlled institution, Calvin became a non-secular institution in the late fifties. For many years, it had been a sleepy undergraduate school principally serving a well-heeled, female student body. Since the late seventies, funded from oil-based revenues within its broad stock and bond portfolio, it has sought to establish itself as a premier undergraduate institution. During the past decade, it has moved successfully along this path: faculty have been lured away from prestigious colleges; each entering freshmen group has been accompanied by an increase in SAT/ACT scores; and prominent public figures routinely visit and lecture. Recently, Calvin College was named as one the country's "best buys" for a college education and cited as one of the top small, liberal arts colleges in the South. In 1984, the entering freshmen student averaged 1120 on collegiate test scores and its undergraduate student body numbered approximately 2400. By 1987, the entering freshmen average SAT test score was 1210 with about the same number of students attending the college.

In the fall of 1984, 17 freshmen entered Calvin College as "Bridenthal Interns." Among the 14 women and three men, selected from more than 100 qualified applicants, were five in Who's Who Among American High School Students, a national merit scholar, two valedictorians, and 10 National Honor Society members. All earned SAT scores exceeding 1000 and all graduated in the top ten percent of their high school class. All but four had seriously considered non-teaching careers such as law, medicine, psychology and engineering. During that fall, all began the work of becoming a public school teacher.

The Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program is composed of three

interrelated and sequential curricular components. Following their successful completion of this curriculum, the interns' loan of $26,000 will be forgiven (FN30).

The Acclimation Component (Spring 1984 - Winter 1985)

> Prior to high school graduation and following a rigorous selection process in the spring, the interns, as beginning college students, meet frequently as a group, attend special seminars and education-related functions, and participate in a number of practicum experiences in surrounding schools during the next eighteen months. A mentor is assigned to help them in their adjustment to the program and to the college.

The Specialization Component (Spring 1986 - Summer 1988)

> Interns pursue specific course work toward their chosen teaching fields and become integrated into Calvin College's standard teacher education program. All interns pursue degree requirements in either the liberal arts or the sciences.

The Professionalization Component (Fall 1988 - Spring 1990)

> After graduation, interns serve a two-year apprenticeship as classroom teachers in a local school district. Close working relationships between the College and education faculty and the interns continue.

As a model reform effort, the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program spans the three areas of teacher education noted in the preceding section. This program exemplifies the self-renewing, pedagogical domino theory (better high school graduates = better college students = better preservice teacher education students = better teacher education program = better teacher graduates = better teaching = better schools = better high school graduates. . .) underlying the teacher education reform model designed to recruit, prepare, and induct the "brightest and best" into teaching.

The Bridenthal Program, then, differs from conventional teacher education programs in several ways: (1) active recruitment of high-ability students into a teacher preparation program that (2) commences the first

semester of the freshmen year and (3) which features a rigorous academic curriculum, early and extensive practicum experiences, and a comprehensive community education program. Further, (4) the program requires a two-year commitment to teach in a local school district whereupon (5) a total student loan package of $26,000 is forgiven. From its inception, the program was viewed as a demonstration project (6) for national dissemination and adoption, (7) to enhance Calvin College's conventional education curriculum, and (8) to distinguish it as an eminent undergraduate institution for teacher preparation.

Description of the Research Project

The study is designed to parallel the six years of the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching (BIT) Program. Its purpose is to independently document the program's strengths and weaknesses through the systematic gathering of qualitative and quantitative data (FN31). Given its ethnographic nature, data-gathering tools include, but are not limited to field notes, permanent audio and video recordings, formal and informal interviews, and participant observations. Additionally, several standardized instruments gauging career interest maturity and value orientation are routinely administered as are paper-and-pencil instruments grounded in previously analyzed data (FN32).

Standard analytic procedures are employed (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Members of the research team meet at the research site one week during each academic semester for planning and data collection purposes. At the conclusion of each academic year, all data are divided among the researchers. These data are analyzed by each researcher prior to theteam's data analysis meeting held during the summer. From this meeting, a set of working hypotheses are generated. These hypotheses become the grounding

for each member's subsequent analysis of his or her data set. Combined individual analysis become a working draft which is then shared with the Bridenthal Interns and staff for comment.

Parallel to the BIT program, the study unfolds in three phases:

1984-1986: Pre-professional Entry

During this phase, formal interviews were conducted with the interns on five separate occasions. Two of these interviews were conducted in small groups; three were one-on-one interviews. At the beginning of their entry, interviews were also conducted with their parents, Calvin faculty, and Bridenthal staff. Two additional, private interviews were conducted with staff and faculty members. All interviews were audio or video-taped and interviewees were assured of the anonymity of their individual responses.

During this phase, one member of the research team served in the role of participant-observer. As a faculty member at Calvin College, this person had daily access to the interns and their everyday activities, as well as to Calvin faculty and Bridenthal staff members. Consequently, extensive data were collected about the BIT program through informal interviews and observations, and review of College documents. Other members of the research team collected data during their twice annual visits to Calvin College. The interns also maintained confidential journals regarding life and school experiences as Bridenthal Interns.

1986-1988: Professional Preparation

During this phase, a randomly selected cohort group (N=11) of Calvin students participating in the "regular" teacher

training program was identified. This group completed the same standardized instruments administered to the interns. Like the interns, members of this group were interviewed twice yearly and asked to maintain a portfolio in the form of journals, papers, and projects produced in conjunctions with their pre-service teaching course work. Grounded upon these data, an instrument designed to quantitatively gauge the Calvin education students' perceptions of their general education program was developed and administered. Individual and small group interviews provided a contextual base for interpreting these data.

The primary focus of the inquiry, however, continued to be the Bridenthal Interns. Observations and reports of their practicum experiences, professional course work, and community education exposure continued. Both individual and small group interview formats were used. Additional interview data were collected from Calvin faculty, Bridenthal staff, Intern parents, and public school progressions involved with the interns' training.

Extensive observations were conducted on both the interns and the cohorts during their student teaching experience. A questionnaire was administered prior to and following their semester experience, classroom observations were made and video-taped, and end of semester interviews were conducted.

1988-1990: Professional Induction

During the final phase, the interns' and cohorts' first two years of public school teaching will be carefully monitored through 1) on-site observations, 2) interview with a purposive

sample of school administrators, faculty, and students, 3) interviews with the interns and cohorts, 4) administration of additional survey instruments.

III. Investment as a Metaphor for Teacher Recruitment

> As fewer high-scoring students enter teacher education, teacher education institutions must decide whether to accept declining enrollments as an inevitable result of market conditions or whether to adopt some strategy intended to maintain enrollments in the face of an unfavorable market.
>
> Phillip Schlechty and Victor Vance (1983:94)

Introduction to Investment

In many ways, recruiting academically talented persons into teacher education is comparable to the process of attracting investment capital through the securities industry. In order to judge the adequacy of this metaphor, this section of the paper will provide an overview of the terms, principles, players, and concerns. Appendix A provides a succinct definition of all investment terms used in this paper.

Investment market. The vitality of a capitalist society varies directly with the capital holders' willingness or propensity to invest a portion of their surplus capital in economic expansion. What motivates the investment of this surplus capital and who are the principal players in the process of capital formation?

Two primary motivations attract investors to commit their surplus resources to the security market. The first and foremost motivator is monetary gain. Entering the risk-reward environment of Wall Street, investors seek a greater return on their investment than what could be realized through the disposition of their capital into holdings such as real estate, precious metals, or municipal bonds. The second motivator is investor commitment. With more than a thousand stocks from which to choose, many investors are guided by their interest in furthering particular types of corporations such as those which rely heavily on military contracts, engage in business with particular foreign governments, or market a personally attractive product.

In most investment situations, the investor is introduced to these financial opportunities through the selective solicitation of a member of the brokerage community. Brokers, like the brokerage house for which they work, are motivated to solicit stock purchases from private capital holders in order to earn lucrative commissions ranging from three to five percent. Between one-third to one-half of this commission is returned to the brokerage house. The firm, after all, has provided the arena for the investor to be accorded financial opportunity and guidance from a knowledgeable broker.

Investors profit when they sell a given stock for more than they originally paid for it. To the layperson, an investor is thought to lose money on a day when the stock averages are down. In fact, the investor only incurs a loss when the stock is sold. Brokers, therefore, profit on both sides of the transaction: the purchase and the sale of stock.

Through the advice of a broker an investor must decide which investment opportunities to take. These portfolio decisions are based upon an overall investment strategy which is sensitive to the investor's available capital, personal concerns, and market forces. These will be discussed shortly. Once a decision is made, the fourth player -- the publicly held corporation -- benefits. Capital invested in a new issue, less a small underwriting percentage, goes to further the economic expansion of the corporation. The corporation is not indebted to the investor as such: no money has to be repaid as would be the case in a bank loan. Capital invested in stock already in circulation does not end up in the hands of the corporation. Instead, the money goes to the seller of those shares. The corporation indirectly benefits by making the investment climate surrounding its security more favorable in the event that its directors desire to come forth with additional issues of common stock.

Within the market system, there is an inherent force that drives corporations to compete for increasing shares of their respective markets. This is the raison d'e'tre for the investment cycle. A prosperous corporation will reward its investors by returning a portion of its profits on a pro rata basis -- a dividend. The prosperous corporation attracts the attention of other potential investors generating further upward movement of its share value.

There are a myriad of forces which propel stock prices higher or drive them lower. Often, as seen in the most recent market crash, market analysts and economists disagree on the impact which various forces have upon the market at any given time. One major risk to the investor lies in the potential inability of corporate management to use the influx capital to advance its share of the market total. There are, however, other forces which contribute to the often roller-coaster world of securities trading. Public fears and hopes, for example, can lead to a "herd instinct" causing indexes to soar or plunge. Individual corporate success is also linked to the fortunes of the national and global economy. During the age of instantaneous communication and program trading, the rise of the Japanese yen, increased government borrowing, or the institution of import duties by the European Common Market, as examples, can quickly affect the fortunes of small investors in Dubuque as well as institutional investors such as state governments, banks and annuity funds. Then, there is the unpredictable event: a war, an embargo, an assassination. These events alter original projections of even the best investment strategist.

Not only must investors be wary of these and other market forces in developing their investment strategy, but they must consider, too, the importance that they attach to a number of personal concerns. The security of the investment certainly is a concern of any investor. The degree of

insecurity the share holder is willing to assume will help determine the type of stock sought, ranging from the least risky (and most costly) blue-chip stocks to the more risky (and less costly) penny stocks. Another concern of the investor is the rate of return. For those investors who wish to realize a high yield, preferred stocks are often sought; for others, willing to accept low quarterly dividends, investment in growth stocks may be preferred.

Although investor losses may amount to 100 percent of the original investment, actual losses depend on how long the share holder is willing to ride out an apparent losing proposition. The key factor in this situation is liquidity. A security can be sold on any business day and settled within seven calendar days. For long-term investors who can afford to maintain their security positions over several cycles of market activity, the potential return-on-investment can be very rewarding. Investors who must "bail out" of the market often confront staggering loses.

The market attracts investors because it is possible to outdistance the ravages of inflation and accrue capital gains more quickly than savings accounts, certificate of deposits, and other banking services. There is also the personal satisfaction gained through one's participation in the capital formation process. Thus, as successful investors tabulate their personal profits they also know that their avarice has contributed to industrial expansion.

In certain cases, the market provides a means for sheltering income. Tax-free municipal bonds can be purchased by those wishing to reduce their tax burden. Certain industries also have been given preferential tax consideration by the government. These industries, such as off-shore oil drilling and natural gas exploration, frequently pass on their dividends as tax-free income to investors due to the high risk nature of their capital

intensive business.

Though there is not a perfect fit between the securities industry and teacher education, this metaphor is useful in examining the strategies and assumptions of reform programs, like the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program, which seek to attract academically talented people into the teaching profession.

Strategies for Attracting Investors into a Profession

> Teachers suffer from the "Rodney Dangerfield syndrome" in that they get little respect from a negative press and public, their jobs frequently put them in positions of fiscal and physical jeopardy, and they have little time or opportunity to make friends and interact with other adults during the course of the school day. From the perspective of intellectual stimulation, self-respect, economic security and friendship it would be irrational for the more able student to choose teaching as a career.
>
> Dean of Education, San Francisco State University (Schwartz, 1984:4)

Investor Pool. Students entering higher education make a variety of decisions not dissimilar to investors entering the financial markets. Prior to investing, both groups must develop an investment strategy. First, members of each must assess their capital assets. For the business investor this is disposable cash-in-hand; for the educational investor this is academic ability. Those in both groups then must determine the degree of risk they wish to assume.

Like the business investor, the educational investor must consider a variety of factors prior to investment. For example, what is the likely rate of return on the investment? Just as the business investor may examine the price-earnings (P/E) ratios of various corporations, so, too, an educational investor can compare the quality and reputation of various professions with their present and anticipated yield. Some professions,

like medicine, are blue-chip stocks. However, in higher education, unlike the world of business, only those student investors with a large amount of what might be termed "cultural capital" (FN33) can afford these stocks. Establishing and successfully maintaining an investment in such stock, however, virtually assures a steady and comfortable return. Other professions, like bio-engineering, are growth stocks. Investors in these professions need a great amount of disposable capital, and a willingness to gamble that their return on investment, in the long-term, will be greater than investment in the more traditional blue-chip stocks.

Whether educational investors choose blue-chip or growth stocks, one pre-requisite is a large amount of cultural capital. These investors represent the "big accounts" which the most prestigious colleges and universities (brokerage firms) routinely attract. As high school seniors, these are the people who graduated in the top decile of their class, scored 1200 or above on the SAT, earned GPAs of 3.9 or higher, listed in the Who's Who of High School Seniors, and lead the academic clubs, sports, and/or student government. These are the educational investors who seldom, if ever, consider investment in the profession of teaching. In the words of American Federation of Teachers' President, Albert Shanker (1987:426), "The message to [these] bright college students considering teaching will be negative. They go to college to become something, and becoming something that anybody can become is not a mark of achievement."

The profession of teaching attracts the more traditional investors: those who have a moderate amount of cultural capital and who cannot afford to invest in blue-chip stocks or to risk their principle in growth stocks. The most attractive securities for this type of business investor are those represented by utility stocks such as telephone and electric. While these companies rarely show large gains, they pay reliable dividends and are

stable market entities. The most attractive professions for this type of educational investor are those in the public sector such as social work and teaching. These professions are dependable sources of income and provide secure career futures.

As high school seniors, these are the people who did reasonably well in their college-track curriculum, scored 950-1100 on the SAT, and participated in the academic clubs, sports, and/or student government. These are the educational investors which the profession of teaching has traditionally relied upon to provide the capital to sustain operations. This is the group that educational researchers may have had in mind when writing, "Choice of one career implies rejection of other alternatives. . . .preparing for teaching is a cheaper option than training for other careers" (Joseph & Green, 1986:30). These "mom and pop" accounts are the bread-and-butter for a majority of colleges and universities throughout the country.

More recently, the profession of teaching, according to many observers, has been attracting -- with disturbing regularity -- a third type of educational investor: the person with little cultural capital who wants to "play, but play it safe" in the academic marketplace. In the financial market, these were the investors who bought "on the margin" during the roaring twenties and who, some historians have charged, greatly contributed to the Great Crash of 1929.

In the educational market, these are the investors who pursue a degree in education because it seems to be the least demanding in terms of intellect and commitment and most promising in terms of a college degree and a career. This is the bottom group which teacher educators, like Timothy Weaver (1979:45), want most to eliminate from the teacher education market:

> [S]tudents are not only constrained by test scores in selection of fields of study but also in the selection of colleges. Money also plays a very significant role. Poor students are more likely to choose colleges consonant with their abilities or ones they can attend while staying at home. They are not likely to select colleges with average test scores above their own. . . Such students tend to be concentrated in the four-year colleges. Given the constraints of institutional and college major selection among this population, many have no choice other than teacher education if they wish to attend college.

In the aftermath of the Great Depression, the Securities and Exchange Commission mandated that margin traders must possess significantly higher net worth than cash account traders. Thus, unlike the education industry, margin accounts in the securities market come from those clients who have the most to invest.

Broker Strategy. Counselors and teachers in secondary and higher education have a principle role in channeling this investment capital into the professions (FN34). Some (college teachers and counselors) work for a particular brokerage house and others (secondary teachers and counselors) work as independent portfolio managers. These brokers' strategies vary with investor groups. For the traditional, "mom and pop" investor, university and secondary school counselors have routinely encouraged investments into the public service sector, particularly teaching. The advice of these brokers also has been particularly heeded by educational investors who have neither the time nor experience in "shopping around" for a profession and who do not wish to invest their entire capital into one company. For these investors, a diversified stock portfolio is desirable. This portfolio often includes a teaching certificate (job insurance if other career possibilities fail to materialize).

Advice from brokers (particularly secondary and higher education career counselors) working with "big accounts" is usually quite different. The cultural capital of these educational investors is routinely channeled

into blue-chip or high-growth stocks. Seldom are they ever encouraged to consider substantive investment in the public sector, as a staff person working with the Bridenthal program was quick to point out:

> It's hard to recruit because of the damn counselors in the public schools. They don't put the word out and they don't push for it. We sent all of this information [about the program] to different schools and the kids that applied didn't hear about it through the counselors. . . .We were lucky if it got tacked on the bulletin board. I called these people repeatedly to set up interviews. A lot of them that we called said, "Well, honey, I'm really sorry but we just don't have anybody interested in education this year. All of our really bright students that could be accepted into Calvin are going into something else. We don't have any good people interested in education."

Another major decision that investors must make is the choice of brokerage firms. Within the educational marketplace, the role of guidance counselors and teachers (particularly those quasi-independent advice-givers at the high school level) is often pivotal. For some educational investors a large and prestigious brokerage house (e.g., a "Big Ten" university) may be recommended; for others, especially those with substantial capital, investment counselors may recommend small but elite houses (e.g., small ivy-league colleges); and, for those with little operating capital, counselors may recommend those brokerage houses which bring together a great number of small investors (e.g., state and community colleges). As in the business sector, the type of brokerage firm educational investors select is an important factor in the shape and success of their investment strategies.

Brokers, of course, not only outline investment strategies for existing clients but also develop strategies to attract new clients into their firms. Again, the strategies pursued by these brokers vary with the type of accounts they wish to attract. For those brokers who generally work "mom and pop" accounts the real challenge is moving as many of these

accounts as possible into their brokerage firm. Thus, some educators within schools and colleges of education have spent considerable time and expense in attempting to attract a greater number of these traditional accounts through their public relations and development officers. This has included advertising in the "educational supplements" of large, metropolitan newspapers, encouraging "alums" to recruit new students, and airing radio and television spots (e.g., MTV) targeted to a college-bound audience.

The problems, of course, are that there are a great many brokerage firms (1200 schools, colleges, and departments of education in the United States) seeking these accounts and, given the relatively small income each of these accounts provide, volume is critical for those firms which deal primarily with these "mom and pop" investors.

Given these problems as well as the relatively low-status that such accounts bring to brokers and their houses, it is not surprising that some are making overtures to "potential investors" with substantial capital who have never considered investing in the Corporation of Teaching. This is precisely the strategy John Wright, the originator and director of the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program, has used.

Offering an attractive scholarship to attend Calvin College, he personally contacted each of the city's 35 high school principals, extending invitations to them, their counselors and teachers to nominate students of high academic ability for the program. Successful applicants would be: invited to become "pacesetters for a new generation of teachers"; tracked into a rigorous and prestigious liberal arts undergraduate curriculum; provided early and special training in a comprehensive teacher education program; afforded extensive publicity and an opportunity to move onto the express career track in the education field; given a forgivable

educational loan of $26,000 (representing about one-half their college expenses); and expected to commit themselves to teaching for two years. These, the "brightest and best" high school seniors, would be the elixir needed to renew the public's declining faith in the Corporation of Teaching (FN35).

Brokerage Firm Strategy. Brokers, like John Wright, and brokerage firms, like Calvin College, are rare to teacher education. Traditionally, conventional teacher training programs within higher education have had no brokers, and the schools, colleges, and departments of education have not viewed themselves as brokerage firms. Consequently, there has been little active recruitment of teachers (Laman & Reeves, 1983). Most institutions have relied on the traditional educational investor simply to walk through their ivy-covered revolving doors. With minimum assistance from schools, colleges, and departments of education, these investors, like those for over-the-counter or NASDAQ stocks, have dealt directly with the corporation (teaching profession). There, too, has been little incentive for teachers and counselors in secondary schools or colleges to recruit outstanding students into the teaching profession. Aside from a personal sense of mission held by certain individuals, institutions rarely have viewed this as an important contribution. Consequently, few educational investors with substantial capital have seriously considered investing in the public sector.

Contrary to this conventional model, the reform model, represented by the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching program, acknowledges that a legitimate role of schools, departments, and colleges of education is to serve in a brokerage capacity between the teaching profession (the corporation) and talented high school seniors (the potential investors). Wright underscores the importance of this role:

> I have to recruit. I simply cannot announce that we have got $70,000 in forgivable loan money that we're just dying to give to bright people. We wouldn't have two people if we had done it that way. Maybe we will always have to recruit bright people. Sometimes we have to beg teachers and counselors to nominate people. In this last round of recruitment, out of approximately 35 high schools in this county 15 of them told me, "We don't have anybody who wants to teach." That was that. They were not interested in that. . . .Of course, that was simply not true. There were bright people in every school who would teach if someone would just engage them in a discussion about it.

Priority, of course, is placed on "good accounts" with the expectations that these "good accounts" will lead to "better accounts" (larger available investment capital) and that, together, these investors will provide the necessary capital to enable the Corporation of Teaching to perform better than expected. This is precisely the strategy employed by "high-stable" institutions (those that attract/produce 60 percent or more of the high scoring teachers) while "high and moderate declining" institutions have maintained and even increased "their share of the new-teacher market by increasing the number of low-scoring white teachers" (Schlechty & Vance, 1983:98).

The brokerage role of departments, schools and colleges within the university, of course, has long been acknowledged by other professions. In outlining a set of recommendations to attract competent students into the teaching profession, one teacher educator noted:

> Business and industry, the military and the government spend millions of dollars to entice the best and the brightest into the fields which service their enterprises. Educators do very little of this. The technology is available which will allow a university and a teacher education program to target a potential population, saturate the media and the school or community college, engage in active recruiting and begin to build some bridges to the programs. Time, resources and the willingness to use commercial techniques to attract students to teacher education are needed to accomplish this. (Schwartz, 1984:21)

More eloquently, Calvin College's Professor Wright stated, "We recruit

halfbacks. We recruit oboe players. But we don't recruit teachers. We sit back in our colleges and universities and wait for them to appear."

Perhaps, the most interesting institutional strategy for attracting better accounts by applying the principles of supply and demand is diversification. Arguing that "talent follows opportunity," Weaver (1984b) proposes that schools, colleges, and departments of education should emphasize their value for individuals wishing to teach in business and industry. As these brokerage firms provided investment opportunities for those interested in more prestigious careers in corporate training, greater emphasis would be placed on the mastery of specific teaching skills and competencies necessary for teaching in any environment. Diversifying to include corporations outside of the public service sector would attract investors with greater cultural capital and would be particularly appealing to those interested in investing in high-tech, growth stocks. In the process, those educational investors who have "bought on the margin" and possess little cultural capital would simply be squeezed out of the market. "The net result," according to Weaver (1984b:187), "would be fewer but better schoolteachers."

Corporate Strategy. As a corporation, the profession of teaching has experienced a variety of internal problems and lacks a favorable public image. Influential market forces (e.g., the opening up of non-traditional investment opportunities to female investors with adequate capital) have also emerged during the past decade. Once considered a noble or at least respectable profession, teaching has lost much of its historical status and the attractors for teaching (e.g., positive community attitudes, relative classroom autonomy) have declined (Kottkamp, Provenzo & Cohn, 1986). In market terms, then, the par value of this common stock has become meaningless and the net worth has declined significantly. Consequently,

this public corporation has lost many of its more traditional investors and has become progressively less appealing to the educational investor with more substantial cultural capital.

During the past few years, however, the Corporation of Teaching has sought to restructure itself and to resurrect its public image. Some reforms, such as entrance and exit examinations administered to students as assurance of minimum competency, are targeted at establishing and improving quality control of the corporate product. Other reforms, such as tightening teacher certification requirements, mandating periodic examinations for teachers and requiring a one year internship and a two year provisional license before certification, are aimed at setting a higher minimum investment in order to get into the game. Finally, some structural reforms, like the proposed establishment of a Board of Standards or the eventual dissolution of undergraduate teacher preparation programs, have sought to wrestle Board control from those who have little or no stock in the corporation or at least to gain a seat on the Board. These and other reform efforts, if implemented, should result in a reversal of the downward spiral in the net asset worth of the teaching corporation's stock. As public confidence in teaching increased, one would expect the status of the teaching profession, and, hence, the market value of its stock, to likewise increase.

A recent nationwide telephone survey of adults, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, reveals that there is <u>very</u> strong support for competency testing of both students and teachers. Such testing includes junior high school promotion tests, a nationwide, standardized examination for high school seniors, and national teacher examinations. As the authors of this report conclude, ". . .the public wants cangible evidence that students are acquiring basic skills in reading and math and

that students and teachers are putting forth sufficient effort to attain this goal. . . .the public has also declared that they want tangible evidence of teacher competence and initiative (Freeman, Cusick & Houang, 1986:15). These conclusions are compatible with data consistently gathered from other public opinion surveys (FN36).

These and other such reform strategies, if successful, likely will be reflected in the market value of its stock. More immediately, however, for adventuresome investors holding substantial capital, the increasing likelihood of such reforms offers an attractive opportunity to buy into this "undervalued stock" with the prospect of reaping a huge return on their investment. Attracting this type of investor relatively early in its restructuring efforts will provide the corporation with much needed capital to accomplish its goals.

Strategies for Attracting Investors into a Profession

> Federal and/or state agents might establish scholarship or fellowship programs for undergraduate study in education. Admission to such programs would be on a competitive basis with awards deferring a substantial portion of college tuition. In conjunction with such a scholarship series, colleges and universities might offer special programs of study involving accelerated work with the finest professors in the major disciplines. In this way, financial incentives coupled with high prestige and the promise of an unusually fine liberal arts education would provide a powerful inducement to enter the field of education. In return, students might be required to major in education, assuming they would go on to teach. A more stringent requirement would exchange several years of teaching for a scholarship, much as R.O.T.C. programs have operated for years. [These] recruitment incentives, alone, however, cannot ensure that young people will find teaching rewarding and so stay on.
>
> Gary Sykes (1983b:117)

Attracting the investor is the first objective of the broker, brokerage house, and the corporation. A second, equally important goal, is maintaining and increasing the value of the initial investment. From the

perspective of the educational broker, this means that investors maintain and strengthen their commitment to the Corporation of Teaching. For the brokerage house, the concern is simply to keep the account within the university. The corporate objective, of course, is to assure a steady flow of investment capital into its organization -- which, in the case of the teaching profession, can only occur after the person has invested four years at the university. All three of these players, then, have an interest in "hooking the investor." From their perspectives, the success of attracting an investor is of limited value if the investor switches to another broker, transfers to another brokerage house, or invests in another corporation. Strategies, therefore, are necessary in order to keep the account. These strategies are based upon assuaging investors' concerns.

The investor confronts a variety of concerns when developing an investment portfolio and making investment decisions. The importance of these considerations -- liquidity, security, return, meaningfulness, and sheltering income -- vary according to the investor's goals and available capital. The strategies, then, adopted by the other players to "hook the investor" must be contoured to those investors whom they already have successfully attracted.

In the case of the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program there were 17 investors who were attracted into the program. Generally, these investors consisted of two types: the Traditionalists and the Mavericks (Sears, Marshall, & Otis-Wilborn, 1987b).

Eight of these interns had seriously considered teaching as a career prior to the announcement of a special program initiated by Calvin College. These investors, the Traditionalists, would probably have entered Calvin or another higher education institution with the intention of majoring in education. Had they not committed themselves to the Bridenthal Program,

however, this investment decision would not have presented itself until the end of their sophomore college year. Given their inevitable exposure to other academic majors and professional careers as well as the reputation among university students and faculty about "education majors" and teaching, these gifted students may well have been lured away from education to more attractive fields of study. In other words, within a conventional teacher education situation, these students would less likely have been "hooked into" teaching.

Eight other talented high school seniors who were recruited into the Bridenthal Program had never seriously considered teaching as a career option. At the time these students formally began the program (four months after their selection), four of them expressed a rather weak commitment to teaching beyond the two year requirement. Three other interns — buoyed by the hype of the program — already were expressing a long-term commitment to classroom teaching. One lone intern had seriously considered teaching as a career <u>prior</u> to the inception of the program yet remained uncertain about the wisdom of this career choice as the academic year began (FN37).

Given the background, commitment and interest of these 17 investors attracted into the Bridenthal program, a set of specific program components were developed to "hook" these investors into the program and into the profession. These components can be most fruitfully discussed with reference to five investor considerations.

<u>Liquidity of investment.</u> As noted above, unlike conventional teacher education programs, the Bridenthal program required a formal commitment from high school seniors. Under the terms of the agreement, the students would receive a $5,000 loan during their first two years at Calvin, a $6,000 loan during their last two years, and a $2,000 stipend during each of their first two years of public school teaching. This $26,000 loan

would be forgiven when they completed their second year in the classroom. In return, these students agreed to follow the professional education curriculum established by Calvin College's Department of Education and to pursue a degree in an academic discipline.

Unlike conventional investors, these interns had little liquidity of investment. As each year passed, the penalty for dropping education as a major or transferring to another university became greater -- a consideration in which they and their parents (as loan co-signers) were well aware. Moreover, these students were expected to complete their program of studies in four years. For most interns, this meant an average semester load of 17-19 credit hours and some work in summer school. Again, unlike conventional students, greater penalties were assessed for getting off the curricular track and pursuing other areas of interest, slowing their academic pace for any reason, or simply withdrawing from school for a semester or two.

Other penalties were exacted upon them as well. These interns, as educational investors, grew to realize the investment-related reality of fees. Based upon maintaining the account and purchasing additional educational stock at specific intervals, brokerage fees deducted from their account affected the relative value of their actual annual yield. Within the Bridenthal Program, these fees included the rising cost of tuition, additional college and state requirements (increasing total credit hours) to be met within the four year period, and expenses related to school practica, summer school, and program-specific travel.

Security of investment. Although Bridenthal investors have comparatively little flexibility in opting out of their investment during the six year program, they do have greater security than the average investor in teacher education. For example, unlike the more conventional

teacher training programs, there are no "education majors" at Calvin. Following the completion of four years of rigorous study in a curriculum of arts and letters, humanities, behavioral science, natural science and/or mathematics, every Bridenthal Intern will earn a bachelor's degree in the arts or sciences from a prestigious college. Unlike a degree in education, the return on a diversified investment of this type is high.

The security of investment, though, is not only tied to the academic reputation of Calvin College but also to the positive public image and high visibility of its Department of Education and its chairperson, Professor John Wright. For several years, the department has sponsored city-wide teacher of the year awards; Professor Wright has been an acknowledged educational leader in the state for the past decade; and the department routinely invites speakers of national and international stature to address its students and faculty. The extensive publicity which the department received for the inauguration of the Bridenthal Program was not unexpected. Since that time, new groups of talented students has been recruited every year (though with lesser fanfare and monetary incentives), the Bridenthal Forum (composed of local, outstanding educators and several national figures) has been established and has produced several "white papers" on teaching, and a national conference on reform in education has been sponsored by the department. From the perspective of investors in the Bridenthal Program, the department has a solid track record of excellence. From the perspective of John Wright, his vision of the role of the department in teacher education is unambiguous and unabashedly grandiose:

> What we want to do is to become one of the places in the country where bright people who want to teach would want to go. We simply want that reputation. A few weeks ago, I was sitting at that table with two parents. The daughter wasn't here yet but was coming the next day. I asked them where she was looking. They said, "Rice, Calvin, and Yale." The mother interrupted and said, "Where would you send her?" I said, "Well, if she's

> interested in pure math, science and engineering -- Rice. If she wants to get a first class general education -- Yale. If she wants to teach -- Calvin."

The Bridenthal Interns are a cornerstone for this vision of corporate excellence. Not surprisingly, they often share the limelight with Wright. Far from being bystanders, they have assumed active roles in speaking before national and regional conferences, meeting with educational leaders, participating in community reform efforts, and recruiting other talented persons into teaching (FN38). Wright recalls:

> They've had opportunities to have exchanges with people from all over the country. I took four [interns] to Florida after the Chicago trip. We started at eight in the morning and finished about 3:30 in the afternoon. . . .Women were there from the League of Women Voters, the Junior League and the American Association of University Women. The kids had two hours of exchange after their presentations. That is very unusual. How many sophomores have had that opportunity?

One of the roles which many of the interns assume, the recruitment of other talented persons into teaching, is another market indicator of the security of their investments. As noted earlier, the long-term market value of their investment rests with the effectiveness of the Corporation of Teaching to resolve its internal problems and to enhance its public image. A key to the success of the corporation's efforts is its ability to attract persons willing to make a substantial capital investment. The Bridenthal Interns have bought into this "undervalued stock" at the ground floor. These "adventuresome investors" can most readily realize a substantial profit if other investors, possessing substantial cultural capital, also choose to invest. From this perspective, the greater number of investors the program (including the interns) attracts the more secure their initial investment. As one intern noted:

> Nowadays kids don't want to be teachers if they're high achievers. They think of teaching as kind of a lower field. I try to convince them that it is a high-calling.

Professor Wright underscored the critical role the interns, as cadet brokers, have played in recruitment:

> The Bridenthal Interns were extremely important to us in the recruitment process. They would host students in the dormitories over night, bring them to class, take them to lunch, and, in some cases, even took them out on the town. One of the interns told me that was the part that he liked most this year -- helping to recruit other bright people.

This pyramiding strategy, of course, is not without its risks. But as more investors are attracted, these risks become more and more distant to the original set of investors — the Bridenthal Interns.

Return on investment. The fact that an investment is secure does not guarantee that a substantial profit will be earned by an investor when the stock is sold. This is an important consideration that influences individual career choice. Based upon analysis of census data for specific patterns of career choice, Sanders (1981) concluded that individuals assign greater weight for their career decisions to factors relating to expected return on investment (e.g., income) than to variables associated with the career risk (e.g., career advancement). There is no reason to believe that participants in the Bridenthal program are any different in this respect.

The ability of the Bridenthal Interns to transform their stock in teacher education into another capital form (e.g., a career in politics or educational administration) or to reinvest it into another corporation (e.g., ministry or medicine) is partly due to the quality of training (stock dividends) which they experienced in the program. Three curricular components in the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program are particularly salient: relationship with power brokers, mentorship arrangements, and pre-professional training (FN39).

Throughout the acclimation phase of the program, the interns regularly met with local, regional and national educational leaders. It was not uncommon for the interns, once introduced to a school superintendent, to be promised or, in some cases, to be pressed to apply for a teaching position within the superintendent's district upon their completion of the program. Similarly, through dialogue with leaders ranging from the chairperson of the State Board of Education to Ernest Boyer, the interns gained insight into the dynamics of educational reform while establishing contact with educational leaders about whom most preservice teachers only study. The impact that relationships among power brokers has had upon the interns is easily discernible through their everyday language:

> Intern 1: It's neat that we get a chance to talk to the mayor and to talk to people in the community. We get to tell them what we're doing and what our goals are. (emphasis added)

> Intern 2: I was talking with Dennis [a local high school principal] the other day about the problem of staff morale. We [some of the interns] may visit his school soon to talk to his teachers.

The most powerful role model of power brokerage witnessed by the interns, however, was exhibited by their mentor, Professor Wright. Wright, the epitome of self-assurance and charismatic leadership, is viewed as supportive, demanding and imaginative by the interns. He is, as one intern remarked during her first year, "our father here in school. He's in charge of everything; he knows everything." Wright has equally positive feelings about his interns. It is a feeling that Wright freely admits he has had for no other group of students during his more than twenty years of teaching. This feeling is captured in the words of a Bridenthal staff person:

> The interns are his own children and the project is like his own baby. He loves them. It's like a breath of fresh air when they

> come into his office. He will just about drop anything to spend some time with them. He loves it.

As an activist and visionary, the interns observe Professor Wright firsthand acting upon his convictions, cultivating personal relationships with those holding power, exuding the confidence to influence important decision makers, bypassing bureaucratic constraints, and translating ideas into reality. A member of the education staff described Wright's modus operandi:

> The man knows what to say, what to do and how to carry himself so that he comes across as right, and right for the right reasons. . . . .He is a thinker. In order to get things done, you first have to envision it. Then you have to set up a plan of action and carry it through. You just don't let things ride by. He definitely doesn't let things roll over. When he wants something to happen he does what is needed to get things done. Little things that may seem enormous he looks at them as no big deal. He does things for the right reasons. His plan of action behind all of it is genuine concern for education and love of education. Although he is motivated by power, I think the core of it is just concern.

While Calvin's academic climate prepares the interns intellectually and the education department will prepare them professionally, Wright readies them for their ministerial mission in public education. Professor Wright comments about the role of his interns:

> They know they are pacesetters in certain ways. They know there is a terrible problem in the recruitment of high-ability people. All of them can look back and see they can be helpful.

As he speaks, Wright utters certain words and phrases which the interns, themselves, echo in their interviews with us: catalysts, pacesetters, educational revolution, first class.

Another key person to whom the interns, as freshmen, could go with their personal, professional and academic concerns was a graduate student who served as their formal mentor. This person worked closely with

Professor Wright and served as a kindred intermediary for the interns. A blend of institutional liaison and trusted friend, the mentor assisted interns in their transition into college and kept them on top of their many and varied responsibilities. The mentor served a critical programmatic function during year one as the hub in a wheel spoked with relative strangers. Reflecting upon her role, the mentor recalled her activities during their first year.

> I kept saying, "Come in whenever you need to." After a few weeks of doing that they would come in all of the time and ask questions about a professor or how they should do a project or just come and sit. That was really nice. Pretty soon they really became comfortable with me. One of the guys even started calling me "mom" because I would call if they were five minutes late. I knew them so well that I knew when one was missing and if they weren't sick that something else was going on. I could find them before Dr. Wright could a lot of times. By the end of the year, I helped get tutors for them. Some of them were having some problems with their roommates and some were just having people problems. . . .I had them make the choices. I didn't make the decisions for them.

Both the mentor and the mentor's role changed during the interns' second year. The second-year mentor underscored the differences:

> Last year the mentor was their mother and sister. She set up the conferences and kept track of their calendars. I don't do any of that. Well, to tell you the truth, I work a lot more with Dr. Wright than I do with the Bridenthal Interns.

By the end of the interns' second year, the mentor's function became a footnote to the program's daily operation. During those two years, however, the mentors enabled the interns to make the most from their educational experience.

In addition to the interns' relationships with power brokers and the availability of mentors, the pre-professional curriculum provided to them was the third critical component that maximized opportunities for the greatest possible return on their educational investment. Unlike students

in conventional teacher education programs, the interns began the study of teaching and education their first day on campus. During the acclimation phase of the program, their pre-professional curriculum included weekly seminars, on-site school field experiences, and community involvement.

The seminars, providing a thorough introduction to schooling in America, allowed the interns to share ideas and insights among themselves and with prominent educators and community leaders. The on-site field experiences ranged from collecting data about a school district, a school within that district, and a child at that school to observing master classroom teachers and serving as classroom aides, tutors, and teaching for a brief amount of time. Community involvement included speaking with community leaders, examining community issues and participating in collaborative volunteer efforts.

As the interns neared completion of the acclimation phase in the spring of their sophomore year, decisions were made regarding the type of specialization they would pursue. The selection of subject matter specialization and certification areas underscored the felt need of the interns, as educational investors, to broaden their portfolio by choosing highly marketable teaching fields. Nearly one-half of the group chose to enter into the special education program (Otis-Wilborn, Sears & Marshall, 1987), and the remaining interns sought secondary certification, primarily in the fields of mathematics and science. No intern chose to pursue a general elementary certificate. This finding is consistent with those who have argued that one goal of educational reform is to provide specialized training for a new middle class who "perform and important role in an increasingly knowledge-intensive reindustrialization process" (Carlson, 1985:174).

Meaningfulness of investment. Other considerations, of course, enter

into selection of a teaching field or area of specialization in addition to market factors. Within the business world, there is often an interest in using social as well as financial criteria in making investment decisions. Social investing ranges from the peace portfolios in mutual stock funds established by Pax World and Dreyfus Third Century in the late sixties to socially oriented money market funds, such as Working Assets, formed in the early eighties. Investment advisors specializing in these accounts have also emerged in what has developed into a $100 billion business (Lydenberg, Tepper & Strubb, 1986).

Not only are persons who use social criteria attracted to particular types of investment opportunities, they also are likely to remain more committed to those investments than the conventional investor. This is true, too, in attracting and hooking the educational investor into teaching. In the late sixties and early seventies, for example, a more talented group of teachers, motivated partly by social concerns, entered the classrooms (Wood, 1978). The Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program has capitalized on this reservoir of social commitment and young people's penchant for fostering change (FN40).

The program is viewed, by its director, as a demonstration project that could lead to national reform and serve as a vehicle for renewal in teacher education. Again, John Wright articulately states his case:

> The original plan was to use this demonstration project as a vehicle to look at recruitment, preparation and retention. . . .We want this project not only to be a demonstration project but we hope that other foundations in the state put up money for the purpose of doing it. We also want it to be a catalyst for our own efforts here at Calvin and really hit the big time right off the bat. On the basis of the success of the Bridenthal Program we have been given a million dollars from the Milligan estate. I just finished recruiting 15 Milligan Interns who will come as freshmen next year. Mr. Bailey may be giving us another gift ($400-500,000) on the strength of our ability to recruit bright people. These will be the Rockford Interns. . . .So, I think we have made great progress. A lot of

> things are happening across the country -- The Congressional Scholarship Program, for instance. I have on my desk this morning an invitation from an educational agency to submit a proposal to get funds to support recruitment efforts in this county using media. . . .I was in California three or four weeks ago talking to the Hewlett Foundation. They are really interested in supporting networks. I think we have a good shot at joining that with a half a million dollars. . . .The Bridenthal Program was really the catalyst in getting the Bridenthal Forum in place. The first report will be released soon and we're going to blanket the state with it. And then the National Conference on Reform is way over-subscribed. Those papers on restructuring the schools will be turned into a book. The Bridenthal Program has been the seed, the vehicle -- and they [the interns] are not even done yet!

The interns became aware of their very special role during their first semester at Calvin. As entering as freshmen most were unaccustomed to this high visibility -- telephone calls from national newspaper reporters, or speaking before national conferences. These activities, coupled with their membership in this very "special group," underscored the social meaningfulness of this program and their place, in the words of one intern, "at the forefront of an educational revolution." As other reform efforts, outlined by Professor Wright, unfolded, the interns increasingly viewed the program as significant, unique, attention-getting and innovative. The prospect of the program serving as a "catalyst" for social change and the interns becoming "pacesetters" for a new generation of teachers appeared promising. In the language of the investment metaphor, these social considerations have contributed to the stocks-earnings momentum. In the language of teacher education, social considerations have contributed to the retention of academically talented students in teacher preparation.

Another factor which contributes to "hooking the investor" through emphasis on social meaningfulness of the investment is group dynamics. By the completion of their acclimation phase, the factor contributing most strongly to intern satisfaction with the program was the opportunity to

develop relationships with other interns (Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1987). This feeling of groupness and camaraderie was an important source of support during the acclimation phase. As pressure intensified for the individual interns, "we're all in this together" became a rallying cry. As one intern candidly remarked, "Not only am I under a loan-scholarship that might make me think twice about changing my major, but I realize I have something good: the help of others in the program. . ."

This involvement with other interns significantly affected intern perceptions of their career choice as well as themselves. As they neared the end of the acclimation phase, one of the dilemmas voiced by several of the interns was the type and degree of commitment to the program and to teaching held by the other interns. These expectations which the interns had of each other and the commitments made by the interns, themselves, made it difficult to acknowledge and deal effectively with feelings such as doubts about career choices, fear of failure, or misgivings about the program (Sears, Otis-Wilborn, Marshall, 1987). It also provided an additional incentive simply to "stay the course" and to maintain their investment strategy.

Sheltering income. A critical consideration for some investors with substantial capital is the need to shelter their income through investments. Based upon market indicators, stock used to shelter is not expected to show a positive return on investment. The loss experienced by the investor, though, is less than would be expected if the capital lay idle and was absorbed though the tax system. Many high school seniors with substantial cultural capital might simply prefer to defer their educational investment but, because of other considerations (e.g., parental pressure or military conscription), cannot afford that luxury. Consequently, they may invest in a degree plan and a profession which does not greatly tax their

time and energy. Traditionally, teacher education has attracted many of these students who simply seek refuge in a relatively easy major and a temporary career.

Given the selective screening, rigorous curriculum, and high expectations for participants in the Bridenthal Program, one would not expect this consideration to be a plausible appeal for either attracting or hooking educational investors into this program. Nevertheless, for one of the 17 interns, sheltering income was an important consideration.

As in the world of high finance, high school seniors with large accumulations of cultural capital are pressured into placing it somewhere. Capital-on-hand, according to the economics of Adam Smith and the ethics of John Calvin, must be put to work somewhere. In the case of this one intern, that "somewhere" happened to be the Corporation of Teaching — a market this intern had never seriously considered entering. For this educational investor, the target market was (and continues to be) the blue-chip stock. Investing in teaching, as an interim move, clearly made more sense to this high school senior than withholding a sizeable set of capital assets from the market or placing them into the market without an investment strategy.

But, why Bridenthal, why teaching, and why Calvin? The unique focus of the Bridenthal Program (preparing "model" teachers and improving the overall quality of the teaching profession) paralleled this interns' fundamental career motivation and fostered an important concern: social reform. This investor's decision to secure "mom and pop" public utility stock also was greatly influenced by the reputation of Calvin College, a highly respected brokerage house, and the efforts of John Wright, its most visible "power-broker." For this intern, too, the leadership opportunities, the prospect of distinguishing oneself through a

high-profile program, the cultivation of relationships with important people, and the acquisition of a degree from a widely respected college were apparent dividends from a capital investment that otherwise would only disappear into the pockets of the tax collector.

I. A Political and Economic Critique of the Bridenthal Reform Model

> All of the reports decry the lack of academic rigor in the schools but only a few decry the lack of intellectual debate as well.
>
> Walter Feinberg (1985:133)

> The supposed crisis in teaching and in education in general is not an isolated phenomenon. It is related to a much more extensive structural crisis in the economy, in ideology, and in authority relations.
>
> Michael Apple (1987:331)

> If educators have been blind to the role and function of teacher education, it is in part due to the study by mainstream educators of such programs under micro-social categories that ignore the historical and political context in which they exist. Thus, we are treated to studies that suggest that the quality of teacher education programs can improve only if they select students with higher SAT test scores.
>
> Henry Giroux (1981:147)

Throughout this century, the education profession has routinely appropriated concepts and innovative approaches from business and industry. Job analysis, management by objectives, quality circles and educational vouchers have been integrated into education through the efforts of leaders such as W.W. Charters, Robert Mager, Milton Friedman, and William Bennett. The wholesale appropriation of these industrial concepts and business techniques as well as their effectiveness when applied to education has been questioned by more than a few scholars and practitioners (FN41).

The securities metaphor, we believe, is a useful descriptive tool for understanding the current reform efforts in teacher education. It is also a powerful analytic tool for examining and critiquing the assumptions underlying current reform efforts epitomized by the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program.

In this section, we will first examine the actual dividends, the potential returns and possible losses on investment for each of the major players of this particular teacher education reform model. We then will

assess the adequacy of this reform model challenging its underlying market-based assumptions. It is our contention that the problems associated with teacher education cannot be isolated from problems within other social institutions. Further, we will argue these problems are symptomatic of fundamental structural flaws which can best be understood through a political and economic analysis. Thus, we will conclude that this reform model will not significantly alter the conditions of teaching or the quality of learning in our nation's schools.

Dividends and potential return on investment

The interns, as investors, benefit in several ways from their involvement with the Bridenthal Internship in Teaching Program. First, they acquire a "first rate" liberal arts education while pursuing an intensive, specialized professional preparation program at a price far below its current market value. Thus, the interns already realize significant dividends vis-a-vis other students who entered Calvin without a 50% tuition and living subsidy. Second, once they complete their six-year commitment, the interns can reasonably expect to realize a substantial return on their investment when they "cash in." The return on investment will to some extent depend upon the success of the Bridenthal Program, the implementation of other programs like it (including the recruitment of other "big accounts"), and the effectiveness of the restructuring and public relations campaign of the Corporation of Teaching. Nevertheless, given their initial subsidy in acquiring this investment, the interns will realize a modest return even if the book value of the stock has remained steady during the interim six years.

Another dividend already paid to the interns has been an enhancement of their collegiate experience. Unlike typical freshmen, these interns

entered Calvin with an established peer group, support network and career direction. Each of these factors allowed the interns to pursue their studies and minimize the acclimation problems normally associated with going to college. Throughout their four years at Calvin these interns, like many college athletes, are provided additional supervision, guidance, and support that enable them to perform to peak ability. Even in their senior year, these graduating students will not have to worry, "Will I get a job?"; their only question will be, "Which among these several offers will I accept?"

The interns will likely realize an easy transition from the world of academe to their career world. As they enter the career world, the interns can expect to reap additional dividends of public visibility, on-site credibility (at least compared to the typical rookie teacher), and substantive institutional support. If they continue in the teaching profession one also would expect that they will quickly find themselves on the "fast track" in professional advancement. Of course, the acid test will occur at the point interns choose to move their investment capital from teaching into graduate studies or another profession. The outcome, at that point, is far less certain.

As an educational broker, John Wright has already received his commission for his role in the Bridenthal Program. Within the state, his previously established reputation as an innovator and reformer has been enhanced. He also has moved several steps ahead on the national ladder of professional recognition. Though the rapidity and direction of his rise in professional stature is ostensibly affected by the success of this program, as we will outline shortly, there is for him -- unlike the interns -- little uncertainty of a positive outcome.

Of course, like other charismatic and visionary leaders, John Wright's

professional acclaim is secondary to (or more accurately a result of) his more critical concern: shaping events and moving others to action. This hope is realized through implementation of similar programs at other institutions, a broadening of the profession's acceptance of his conception of good teachers and effective teacher education programs, and the development of Calvin College as a premier teacher training ground. The many programs which Wright considers "spin-offs" to the Bridenthal Program and his increasingly active role in national educational reform efforts evidence his desire to expand his brokerage role. In the words of John Wright:

> If this demonstration project zips along and ends six years from now with 17 persons teaching for two years or more, and that's that and we're back to business as usual, nobody has picked up on it, nobody gives a good-damn whether we have high-ability people or not, then it has been a failure.

Calvin College, too, has earned a substantial commission from the Bridenthal Program. Media coverage has been widespread and uniformly favorable, and wealthy individuals have established endowments to continue Calvin's leadership role in teacher education. As Wright reveals:

> On the basis of the Bridenthal Program we have an endowment for scholarships of $1,250,000 that we didn't have in the beginning. We would not have this, in my judgment, without the success of this program. We have a half-million additional dollars pledged but unpaid. I don't know a department [of education] in the state or beyond that has an endowment for scholarships or forgivable loans.

Two other classes of high-ability students, the Rockford and the Milligan Interns, have been admitted -- though without the corresponding forgivable loan package. The admission of these talented students has contributed to Calvin's upwardly spiraling freshman SAT scores. Within this context, the status of the Education Department within the college and the power which it wields with the College's president has also been enhanced.

Not only has the Education Department enhanced its status and become a more powerful force in college politics, but the Bridenthal Program has served as a catalyst for radically overhauling the department's more conventional teacher training program. Several of the successful components of the program, including freshmen seminars, mentors, and field experiences, have been integrated (FN42). Additionally, the reduction of the number of elementary methods courses (Wright asks, "How many damn times can you talk about the discovery technique?") and the implementation of a humanities-based curriculum for elementary teachers has occurred. Wright also projects the development of a fifth-year program of teacher training in the not too distant future for Calvin.

During a time when greater cooperation between schools, colleges and departments of education, and public schools has been targeted as an important goal in the national reform agenda, the Department of Education at Calvin has also strengthened its ties with the local public schools. As Wright notes:

> There's been so much talk around the country about having better connections with the schools. . . .We have increased, substantially, the practice that all our students get now. The Bridenthal students were the vanguard.

The final player in this game of educational investment is, of course, the Corporation of Teaching. The success of the Bridenthal Program to attract high-ability students into teaching, to publicize these efforts, and to disseminate this reform model, will help, according to some observers, to slow the downward spiral of public confidence in teaching and teacher education.

> The viability of the profession and its future are tied to its image. Currently, the image of teachers and teacher preparation programs is somewhat negative. In addition, teaching is not

> viewed as an exciting, rewarding profession by those preparing to enter college. Educators must be willing to shoulder the responsibility for upgrading the image and for identifying/admitting highly qualified students into teacher preparation programs. (Tack, 1986:76)

As noted earlier, this is a critical precondition if the market value of this corporate stock is to increase.

The Bridenthal Program, too, benefits the Corporation of Teaching by virtue of its service as a public test of the much discussed model of teacher education reform: the recruitment, preparation, and retention of the brightest and best into teaching. The greatest benefit for the Corporation, of course, will occur if the program's graduates enhance the "quality of classroom instruction" and attract other educational investors with substantial cultural capital into the market.

Potential losses and return of investment. Though each player has already benefitted from their involvement in this educational transaction, some of the players may, nevertheless, be less satisfied than others when the game is over. Several scenarios in which the players may sustain substantial losses are outlined below.

As educational investors, the interns have assumed several risks. First, given the minimal liquidity that this investment has, they may find themselves continuing their preservice teacher education at Calvin with little enthusiasm or interest. With the exception of the most desperate situations, these investors simply cannot afford to pay the penalty for early withdrawal. In such cases, "sticking it out" becomes the only pragmatic decision.

The practical absence of liquidity in this investment results in little incentive to explore other investment opportunities. While college students generally experience enormous latitude to consider and to explore

a variety of professions, investors who are "locked in" may be less inclined to seriously consider or carefully explore other career investment options. In this second scenario, we suggest that the career maturational process, rather than being accelerated, would be adversely affected (FN43). This is a particularly salient consideration given that few of the interns originally were committed to a long-term investment in teaching. These interns, at the end of six years, may find themselves significantly disadvantaged compared to their college peers vis-a-vis their exposure to other careers and their ability to map-out effectively personal career strategies. Thus, at 24, some of these interns may well be asking the sophomoric question, "What do I really want to do with my life?"

The bottom line, of course, for these educational investors will be the return on investment they realize if they choose to liquidate their interests in the teaching profession. As noted earlier, since their investments were subsidized by 50%, the market value of the stock would actually have to decline substantially for them to realize any absolute loss. However, the effectiveness of their investment strategy also must be examined from a relativist position. That is, what percentage of gain have they realized compared to other high-ability students who invested their cultural capital in blue chip or high-growth stocks? The answer to this question will bear significantly on their future securities.

The educational broker, John Wright, can only experience a loss during the six year mandatory investment period if an investor shifts to another broker (and therefore into another professional career). After that time, in whatever area investors chooses to invest or reinvest their cultural capital, John Wright can claim success. For example, if an investor chose to move one's cultural capital into another investment, such as law or business, then the two-year stint in teaching is interpreted, as Wright

suggests below, as a domestic application of the Peace Corps model:

> Some have made it known from the very beginning that they want to do something else, law school in one case and college teaching in another case. That's fine. What we try to do here is not unlike what the Peace Corp did.

This approach, though, has been criticized:

> It is a current cliche` to exhort teacher educators to recruit the brightest, best prospects. Some of them come to teaching through their sincere desire to serve, but many will continue to opt for professions that support a more affluent life. College faculties abound with former teachers, as do the ranks of law.

Not surprisingly, few members of college faculty, like John Wright, would agree with this position. Most teacher educators would likely concur with Yale scholar Richard Murname (1983:567):

> I wonder how many talented college graduates are discouraged from teaching by rhetoric that suggests that anything less than a lifetime in the classroom implies both a failure in the structure of the teaching profession <u>and</u> a personal failure. . .

In this scenario, an intern-investor might seek a greater voting share in the Corporation of Teaching by choosing to exit the classroom after two years and enter graduate school in educational administration. From such a perspective this action would evidence the double success of the Bridenthal Program. First, the program was successful by attracting this intern into teaching. Second, the program is able to retain this intern in the education profession by channeling the person's talents into a role of administrative change agent. This reasoning clearly guides the thinking of one education professor at Calvin College:

> We're in the business here of creating change agents and future leaders. I've never viewed programs such as this one as going in and staying with children. I hope they stay a life-time and influence many children. I don't think they will. I view them more as being the leaders in education. A number of them will choose to move into administration. . . .[B]ecause of the resources spent on these kids they have to make an impact on children but first they have to make an impact on the professionals.

What if the investor continues with the investment in teaching beyond the two year requirement? Probably, the intern who returns to the classroom a third year evidences an intrinsic commitment to teaching. These returning interns, too, would clearly demonstrate the successful accomplishment of the original program goals: the recruitment, preparation and retention of high-ability persons into the teaching profession. From this perspective, the program would be considered by many as an effective shop-floor model in teacher education.

This judgment of success is, of course, problematic as suggested in questions such as: Is three years a sufficient indicator of retention? Are the interns who continue to teach those who had expressed an interest in teaching prior to their enrollment in the program? How effective are these returning interns as classroom teachers and professional colleagues? The answers to these and other such questions, of course, are also much more problematic than the unequivocal statement: Ten interns continued to teach beyond their two year commitment. It is the simplistic power of such a "numbers" statement that will insure the program will be deemed a success in the minds of many observers. Equally clear is that the answers to these problematic questions of program success have little salience to Wright:

> You can expect to focus on this class and wonder how many in the 17 will teach two years. Maybe what will happen to them after two years? There's a whole series of potential problems: How many will finish [the program]? . . . But, I have really been thinking beyond that. I've had letters from across the country . . .It's been here and yonder. People have written saying, "send me information. I want to try something in my neck of the woods."

What loss might the brokerage house experience by involvement with this program? From the vantage point of the brokerage house, Calvin

College loses only if the investor moves to another firm or exits the educational market during the first four years. Although it may be in the interest of the college for the investors to continue working with their original broker (keeping in mind the commissions already earned for the house by the broker), as long as the account stays within the firm then no loss is experienced. Whether the student, as educational investor, purchases stock in teacher education or business management, the firm collects its commission.

The Corporation of Teaching, as noted earlier, also has reaped benefits from this program since persons with substantial capital have been attracted to it. The Corporation will only experience a net loss if one of four conditions occur. First, these investors move their capital into another investment opportunity at a faster rate than what the Corporation has experienced with investors of similar background in the past. For high-ability students this is typically seven years (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Second, other investors, possessing less cultural capital but continuing their investment for a longer period of time, are squeezed out of the market altogether. In this scenario, as Weaver (1984) acknowledges, the value of teaching will rise and the supply of a satisfactory pool of teachers will dwindle due to the increasing difficulty for an investor of modest means to buy into the market. Thus, a high school senior possessing a strong desire to teach but scoring 900 on the SAT may find education as difficult a field to enter as engineering or pharmacy. This has particular implications for preparation of minority educators (FN44).

Third, these interns are unable to enhance the status of teaching or the quality of learning experienced by their students. They may not be willing to work within the excessively bureaucratic and intellectually

stultifying context of public school teaching. They may find themselves isolated or simply incapable of restructuring the teaching field. As one faculty member working with the Bridenthal Interns wondered:

> Are they going to get out there and not be able to change the world and then think, "Well, to hell with it! I'll go do something else because I'm bright and I can do it." Or, will they stay with it and have a commitment to improving the field? I don't know.

Educational research has consistently demonstrated that those intrinsic considerations which bring people into teaching often lead to frustration when they confront institutional and contextual barriers which makes effective teaching more difficult (FN45). These intrinsic factors are particularly relevant for academically talented persons (Smith, 1986). Summarizing this research, Linda Darling-Hammond (1984:13) of the Rand Corporation states:

> Those with academic majors are more dissatisfied with the lack of administrative support for their work, with bureaucratic interference in their work, with their lack of autonomy, and with salaries and other working conditions than are those with education degrees only. . . .They are much more likely than other teachers to say they plan to leave teaching.

This may explain why one-third of the most academically-talented students leave teaching within two years (Schlechty & Vance, 1981). This, too, may be a explanation if the Corporation of Teaching realizes losses from the Bridenthal group.

There are, of course, other explanations for the departure of high-ability teachers from the classroom. One is that these persons are, in general, simply not effective teachers with students other than those who, like themselves, are academically able and motivated, and who tend to play down the importance of socio-emotional development of students (Villeme & Hall, 1986). Given that few first year teachers have the

opportunity to spend most of their classroom day with the school's "brightest and best" students, it would not be surprising if these teachers experienced personal frustration and classroom failure from relatively poor student achievement, and poor working relationships with less talented colleagues (Rosenholtz, 1985).

These super-teachers, too, could simply compete among themselves for the creme de la creme of the student body. Such "competition among those talented teachers to win the allegiance of a limited number of the best students," as Grant (1983:607) observed, "does not create a good environment. . ." Academically-talented teacher recruits, like the Bridenthal Interns, who must deal with other than the most sought after students also may direct resentment toward those "less able" students with whom they must work for two years. Not only might they hold comparatively high (and possibly unrealistic) expectations for what these students can accomplish (Hawley, 1974) but, as Gary Sykes (1983b:117) suggests, "to lure academically capable people into the field via fellowship money then coerce a grudging period of service is not likely to yield excellent teaching."

A fourth factor which might contribute to a corporate loss through the interns' involvement with this program is the influx of "short termers" in the classroom (Lamar, 1985:34). These persons may lower the professional status of teaching. As Donald Warren (1985:5) conjectures:

> Current proposals offer strategies for raising the quality of those entering the teaching profession. Teaching shortages in mathematics and the sciences are to be reduced, for example, by appointing retired people and housewives with appropriate academic degrees to teaching positions. Others can become teachers by completing an undergraduate major in a standard discipline and an extended apprenticeship in the "real world" of the classroom. People will be encouraged to view teaching as a temporary commitment, not necessarily a lifelong profession. Formal teacher education will not be the exclusive province of schools, colleges or departments of education; other academic units will assume major roles in teacher preparation. Certification will reflect tested academic achievement and

instructional competence, not an array of educational courses. As states adopt such proposals, they reverse developments of the past 150 years that were intended to professionalize teaching and teacher education.

Critique of the Bridenthal Model. This model rests squarely within a conventional understanding of teaching and teacher education. Effective teaching is equated with outstanding student performance on standardized tests. "Bright" students are presumed to graduate as more effective teachers and thus be worth additional expenditures for their recruitment, preparation, and retention. The malaise of the profession of teaching is assumed to be a result of poorly prepared teachers in watered-down schools, colleges, and departments of education.

Underlying these assumptions is a technical, mainstream orientation to teacher education. At the micro-level, technical oriented persons dwell upon academically inferior preservice teachers, poorly skilled teachers, and ill-prepared students. Competence is conceived as performance tied to specific skills. These people champion technical proposals to legislate competence through raising admission standards, to implement competency-based examinations, to mandate internships prior to certification, and to monitor academic performances of students. They presume the problem of teaching, to paraphrase Shakespeare, lies not in the stars but in ourselves.

Others focus on macro-level technical problems. Their primary concern is with those extant political and economic factors affecting teaching and teacher education. The problem centers on "factors such as the political and economic priorities of the society and the nature of the classroom and the school as a place of work" (Kerr, 1983:531-532). Thus, implementing the technical proposal cited above while ignoring macro-level issues are viewed as counterproductive and are expected to result in "considerable

quantities of paperwork and a more tightly bureaucratic, rationalized system — a system that in effect will further reduce the prospects for an overall improvement of teacher competence by serving to reinforce the present constraints on teaching and teacher education" (Kerr, 1983:543).

The problem, from this perspective, is how to technically adjust the political and economic machinery of nascent capitalism in order for its institutions to be functional. Thus, these persons seek to restructure the political apparatus of schooling through efforts such as equitable funding among school districts within states and improved the conditions of work within schools and classrooms.

While the micro-level reformer focuses on individuals (students, teachers, schools) and the macro-level person emphasizes institutional reform, both view educational reform as a process of technical adjustment.

We reject this position. The much ballyhooed problems in teacher education are not rooted within individuals or institutions. The dilemma of teacher education is part of a much larger structural crisis in the economy, in ideology, and in authority relations (FN46). Decisions about how to recruit high-ability students into teacher education or how to equalize financial resources among school districts, like attempts to attract better accounts into a brokerage house or eliminate program trading, do not challenge the constitutive structure of the institutional game: be it the teaching profession or the securities industry.

Not surprisingly, the strategies developed from these types of questions are ameliorative in nature and conservative in intent. The reform reports and those who write them, as Ira Shor (1986:408) has discussed, bypass uncomfortable political questions:

> The official [educational and reform] reports explained away the real issues in the teacher shortage and in the decline of education. They chose, instead, "blaming-the-victim" formulas

> such as student-teacher "mediocrity," the need for "excellence" and higher "standards," the softness in a "cafeteria-style" high school curriculum, and the "breakdown of discipline" in school and the family. In reality, the current crisis resulted from budget cuts that left class sizes too large, school buildings shabby, instructional materials in short supply, educational programs unable to afford careful mentoring of student teachers, and aging academic departments deprived of new blood. Further, conservative educational policy in the 1970s imposed depressing programs of careerism and back-to-basics, making intellectual life in the classroom dull, vocational and over-supervised. These new curricula discouraged creativity and liberal education. They invited gifted teachers to leave the profession, while they dissuaded students from thinking of education as an exciting career.

The educational reform proposals and those who adopt them, as Michael Apple (1987:331-2) notes, ignore the larger crisis:

> [D]ominant groups have been relatively successful in exporting the larger crisis away from themselves. When achievement is low among certain groups, when there are significant rates of negative intergenerational mobility, when workers have little enthusiasm for their jobs, and so forth, the public is asked to blame the school and the teachers. That is, rather than focusing directly on what may be the major sources of the problem -- for instance, the immensely high under- and unemployment rates among working-class and especially minority youth who often see little future for themselves, an economy in which 80 percent of the benefits consistently go to the top 20 percent of the population, corporate decisions that cause millions of employees to work in low-paid, deskilled, and boring jobs (or to have no jobs at all), or an economic system that by its very nature needs to subvert traditional values, authority relations, self-discipline, and accepted conceptions of legitimate knowledge in order to create new "needs" and to stimulate the purchasing of commodities, and so forth -- the problem is placed on the educational system. If only teachers were better prepared, if only teaching and curricula were more tightly controlled and better managed, if only textbooks were more demanding and discipline and work skills were stressed, all of the above problems would be solved. The diagnosis and cure are actually a form of category error and would be easy to dismiss on empirical grounds if only they were not taken so seriously.

During the past year, institutional crises have surfaced in government, church and business. Public focus, though, is on personal idiosycracies and isolated events rather than on the systemic disarray of structural relations.

Revelations from the Irangate scandal, for example, momentarily raised the democratic veil within this country exposing "a government within a government" and challenging the credibility of reified concepts such as "informed electorate" and "balance of power." The investigative focus of both the congressional sub-committees and the special federal prosecutor, however, shifted quickly to individuals: the swashbuckling and articulate Oliver North; the ailing and secretive William Casey; the dutiful and beautiful Fawn Hall. The ensuing reports, beginning with the Tower Commission and ending with the "majority" and "minority" reports of the Joint Congressional Committee, point to flaws in personnel, practice, and communication. Proposed reforms were largely technical: better reporting mechanisms; an elite Congressional overview committee; new personnel. Investigator reforms remained mute, throughout, about federal policies and actions which predicated the Iran-Contra scandal, moral and ethical dimensions of governmental practices exposed by the scandal, governmental structures which enabled the scandal to occur, or global economic interests which the covert actions were designed to serve. Instead of hard questions about presidential "findings" and contra funding, investigators attended to snow tires and alarm systems. Illegitimate actions were those conducted by "loose canons" motivated patriotic concerns not orchestrated within institutional labyrinths to maintain political and economic global hegemony.

The sex scandal that has rocked the PTL club provided another opportunity to confront the larger crisis. Rather than examining the undisclosed use of hundreds of millions of dollars of tax-exempt donations annually funneled into tele-evangelism, the public tuned to an unraveling soap opera featuring failed husbands, spoiled women, and unprincipled salvation brokers.

An institutional crisis has also befelled business. "Insider trading" scandals, mixing cocaine with insider tips, have led to individual prosecutions and stiff sentences to Club Med-type prison facilities. Calls have also been heard from leading business school deans to integrate business ethics into the MBA curricula. The recent stock crash of Black Monday, wiping 503 billion dollars of paper wealth, has been labelled by President Reagan as a "market correction" with the "fundamentals of the economy very strong." Again, the focus is on individuals and isolated events with a heavy layer of reassurance spread over the body politic. No analysis is forthcoming about the structural problems experienced by the major industrial powers vis-a-vis expanding markets, shifting from a goods-producing to a service/information labor force, balooning third world debts, and declining standards of living.

Too few analysts and economists remember the fundamental purpose the market was designed to serve:

> The clearest message of the 1987 crash is that the stock market as it now operates does more harm than good. The purpose of capital markets should be to channel savings into productive investments. The stock market, if it ever did this, doesn't do it anymore. Now the stock market has become a casino in which the big players gamble frenetically for artificial short-term winnings. The games in this casino have little to do with productive use of capital. . . .But as John Maynard Keynes observed during the last depression, the orthodox fetish for individual liquidity "forgets that there is no such thing as liquidity of investment of the community as a whole." Capital, even when privately owned, is a social resource. Its custodians -- the pension funds, mutual funds, banks, and insurance companies -- must behave as responsible stewards of that resource.

During this New Guilded Age, there are few members within Wall Street who act as custodians of the public wealth. Dividends and potential returns, not ethics and social responsibility, rule the boardroom -- as it does the Pentagon, the parsonage, and the schoolroom. Rugged individualism is the preeminent value. Corporate profits accompany individual gains:

what profits the individual benefits the corporation; what motivates the investor stimulates the corporation.

Within this cultural and economic context, teacher education reformers seek the big accounts, "the brightest and best," to enter the market and elevate the Corporation of Teaching. Programs, like Bridenthal, attract investors motivated by avarice not sacrifice. Reformers, such as Wright, view the crisis in education as a problem of teacher competence and institutional constraints which the free hand of an unfettered, free market will resolve. For Wright, Bennett and Friedman the crisis in education is not a reflection of profound social and economic inequities which honeycomb this society. The role of schools in reproducing authority relations within society and instilling ideologically-honed values within a "value-free" curriculum is dismissed as leftist rhetoric. The roles of teachers and students as both victims and victimizers through either their complacency or resistance is minimized. The conception of critical pedagogy (FN47) is diluted with Hunteresque recipes and lost in the curriculum of James Madison High School.

Are the social and economic contradictions reflected in this crisis becoming apparent to the average person? Our sense is that it has not. Institutional workers (teacher educators, politicians, ministers, and business people) will continue to work overtime paving over these structural cracks. The goal, at this juncture, is to maintain public confidence. Should faith in these institutions be lost, then social collapse will be hastened.

It is this fear of public panic which motivates many of the reforms in teacher education. The inevitable erosion of institutional credibility renders powerless those who hold stock in the Corporation of Teaching. The coming collapse of the corporation has already been signaled by recent

state intervention. Witness New Jersey's celebrated plan to require that teachers only have a college degree, attain a passing score on a subject matter test, and complete an internship in a school. The elimination of the broker, not surprisingly, has many teacher educators, including John Wright, worried:

> If we look down the road in teacher education, the strongest programs will be consortiums -- teacher education programs in partnership with the schools. If we don't do that, alternative certification will run us right out of business.

In an effort to avoid this type of hostile takeover, teacher education reformers like Wright have un-mindfully borrowed a broker-investor concept from the world of business. There is indeed a paradox of employing the securities model to solve a problem rooted in the very economic dislocations brought about by advanced capitalist structure. Through the power of ideology, however, this paradox is glossed over.

Assume, if you will, high-ability people can be recruited into teacher education; they will enter classroom teaching in sufficient numbers for a meaningful period of time; they are effective with a variety of different type of students in different institutional contexts; and they will not eliminate the average person from the teaching pool. Given these conditions, this model can only work if the problems of teacher education are rooted in the individual. On the other hand, if all of the proposed assumptions hold true, but the problems of teacher education are structural and symptomatic of a systemic crisis of institutions, then these reform efforts do not serve the public interest.

The four major assumptions of the Bridenthal Program -- (1) "the best" students can be matter-of-factly defined and identified; (2) these student should be recruited into teaching, (3) these recruits "deserve" more (more money, more prestige, more opportunities) than other prospective teachers; and (4) these recruits will be better than the average classroom teacher --

are based upon a questionable economic model of free market economy and an ethically bankrupted conception of human motivation. In the process, beliefs underlying the teacher preparation of academically gifted students are reified. In the process, money and effort which could go toward teacher recruitment and preparation of unemployed youths or minority students, or that could be expended toward liberatory education is lost.

Reforms, like the Bridenthal Program, simply re-shuffle the same tired and tattered cards of institutional reform. The players may be different and the hands they hold may change, but the game remains the same. It is a game that those in policy making and power positions know only too well. It is a game that legitimates unequal social and economic relations glossing over structural contradictions It is a game that even those teacher educators advocating model reforms, like the Bridenthal Program, are likely to lose as Mark Ginsburg (1987:27), in his critical analysis of historical studies of teacher education, concludes:

> Similar previous efforts have usually failed dramatically to enhance the status, power, and wealth of the educationist associated with the more desirable programs and students. Moreover, such strategies have helped to solidify ideologically the unequal relations within which educationists find themselves subordinated.

APPENDIX A

INVESTMENT TERMS

BLUE-CHIP STOCK -- Least risky of the investment situations. Generally, the price of a blue-chip will decline less in a bear market.

BOOK VALUE -- What the stock is worth from an accounting point of view

BROKER -- Agent who links a buyer with a seller and charges a commission for these services

BROKERAGE FIRM -- A company employing brokers making it convenient for buyers and sellers to transact business

BULL MARKET -- Period of upward moving stock prices

COMMON STOCK -- A publicly held corporation offers shares of ownership to investors in return for capital to use in expansion

DOLLAR AVERAGING (Dollar Cost Averaging) -- Purchasing stock at specific intervals with hopes that over time the average cost per share will be successively lower

GROWTH STOCK -- Generally considered to be those companies that have good earnings potential but a very low dividend (pay-out ratio) because profits are being re-invested

INVESTMENT STRATEGY -- The timing of purchases and sales in the market

INVESTOR -- A person who purchases common or preferred stock (or bonds) in publicly held corporations

LIQUIDITY -- The ease in which an asset can be converted into cash

MARGIN ACCOUNT -- Brokerage House will loan the more affluent client money to buy stock providing that the client pay a specified percentage of the total amount (currently 50 percent). The investor is charged interest on the loan and stands to gain substantially if stocks increase in value. The margin trader will have to continually feed more money into this account to maintain certain prescribed ratios if stocks fall in value. Margin accounts are limited to those persons with net worth exceeding $100,000.

MARGIN PURCHASES -- Purchases of stock made with funds that are partly borrowed

MARKET INDICATORS -- Certain index numbers that measure movements in stock prices such as the NYSE, Corporate, Dow-Jones, and Standard and Poor's

MARKET VALUE -- What you have to pay for the stock if you wish to buy it, or what you would get for the stock if you wish to sell it

NASDAQ STOCKS or OVER-THE-COUNTER STOCKS -- Non-listed securities

PAR VALUE -- The face calue of a stock printed on the certificate. This is a meaningless term for common stock today

PREFERRED STOCK -- A form of investment that pays a fixed dividend and is usally purchased as an income producing vehicle. Corporate earnings are low and common stock dividends cannot be paid. Stock owners have preference to earning distribution in the form of dividends.

PRICE-EARNING RATIO (P/E RATIO) -- Market price of a stock divided by a company's earning per share. Certain industries have certain P/E ratios so that one who is aware can scan these figures to ascertain whether a corporation's stock is under-valued or over-valuded by the market

RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI) -- When a stock is sold, the profit (or loss) is combined with income derives from dividend distribution. Expressed as a percent

SECURITY -- The degree of risk associated with a particular investment. Security risks include purchasing power risk, market risk, interest rate risk, and credit risk.

SELLING LONG -- Purchasing the stock first and then selling it

SELLING SHORT -- The reverse of buying long. Customer believes the price of a stock will decline so the investor sells shares that are not owned and then purchases shares at the lower price to complete the transaction.

YIELD -- Expressed as a percentage. The amount of corporate distributed to the stock holder quarterly (usually) on a pro-rata basis.

ENDNOTES

1. Borkow & Jordan, 1983; Feistritzer, 1983; Laman & Reeves, 1982; Weaver, 1979; 1981.

2. Metz & Crane, 1980; National Education Association, 1960; Pavalko, 1970

3. Everden, Gamble & Blue, 1935; Nelson, 1985; Riccobono, et al., 1981

4. Among the more revealing are: The Commonwealth Teacher Training Study (Charters & Waples, 1929); the National Survey of the Education of Teachers (Cooper, 1932); the reports issued by the National Society of Colleges of Teacher Educators (1935; Harap, 1951); the several national conferences by the Commission on Teacher Education on through the National Council on Education (Armstrong, et al., 1944; the more recent conferences sponsored by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards under the auspices of the National Educational Association (Stinnett, 1955; Hodenfield & Stinnett, 1961; Lindsay, 1961; Lortie, 1966; Sarason, et al., 1967), as well as the conferences sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education (Smith, 1962), the Grove Park Conference on Higher Education and Teaching (Vogt, 1965), and the Rochester Conference on the Implications of Research Relating to Teaching (Corrigan, 1967); the reports issued by the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education (Bagley & Learned, 1920; Learned & Wood, 1938), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Feistritzer, 1983), the National Educational Association (1982), the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; the Southern Regional Education Board (1983), the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985) as well as others (e.g., Stiles, et al., 1960; Study Commission, 1976; Trout, 1943). A useful review of the more recent set of reports is found in Darling-Hammond (1984).

5. The few relatively fine descriptive studies include: Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1986; Giroux, 1980; Popkewitz, 1978; Poplewitz, Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1979; Sears, 1984; Smith, 1978; Zeichner, 1980.

6. Barr, 1984; Barr, 1987; Reagan, 1983; H. Schalock, 1987; M. Schalock, 1987

7. Denton, 1983; Fratiani, 1979; Jenkins, 1978; Wahlstrom & Danley, 1979; Weaver, 1983

8. Brownlee, 1985; Reed, 1976; Shank, 1978

9. Brownlee, 1985; Carpenter, 1973; Gress, 1977; Laman & Reeves, 1983

10. Pigge, 1985; Roberson, et al., 1983; Sykes, 1983; Vance & Schlechty, 1982; Weaver, 1984

11. AACTE, 1983; Book, et al, 1985; Dupuis, 1984; Fisher, 1984; Fisher & Feldman, 1985; Krockober, et al., 1987; Loadman, 1983; Nelli, 1981-82; Nelli, 1984; Olsen, 1985; Villeme & Hall, 1985. The apparent incosistencies of these data and the tendency of advocates for teacher education reform to cite selective research studies bolstering their arguments provide the context for a conclusion rendered in a recent review of research on teacher education (Lanier & Little, 1986):

> The research on students of teaching over the past decade tends to be desultory in nature, poorly synthesized, and weakly criticized. . . . As a consequence, misrepresentation and overgeneralization of research findings has occurred in response to growing public interest.

12. Mark & Anderson, 1985; Pavalko, 1970; Schlechty & Vance, 1983

13. Pavalko, 1970; Pigge, 1985; Schlechty & Vance, 1981

14. Vance & Schlechty, 1982; Vance & Schlechty, 1983

15. Brophy's assertion is not supported even within his own paper. Among the eight teacher characterisitcs/benefits associated with producing student learning gains which he contends are supported by research are teacher expectations, classroom management, mastery teaching, and curriculum pacing. Characteristics commonly associated with "bright persons" are <u>not</u> discussed.

16. Perry, 1981; Villeme & Hall, 1980

17. These are reviwed in Weaver, 1978

18. Maguire, 1966; Shim, 1965

19. Emanuel, Larimore & Sagan, 1974; Jencks, et al., 1972; Massey & Vineyard, 1958; Quirk, 1973; Siegel, 1969; Silverston, 1984; Summers & Wolfe, 1975; Taylor & Miller, 1985; Washburne & Weil, 1960. One researcher (Baker, 1970) has found those factors to be insignificant predictors of teaching success when variables, such as screening interviews, are controlled.

20. Getzels & Jackson, 1963; Pugach & Raths, 1983; Morsh & Wilder, 1954; Sykes, 1983

21. Ducharme, 1970; Hellfritzch, 1945; LaDuke, 1945; Morsh & Wilder, 1954; Rostker, 1945; Pratt, 1986

22. For a thorough review of teacher education reform proposals, policies and programs initiated during the 1980s, see: Sears, Marshall & Otis-Wilborn, 1988.

23. Roberson, et al., 1983; Sykes, 1983; Weaver, 1984

24. Downhower, 1982; Hankins, 1982

25. Brogdon & Tincher, 1986. See also, Kemper & Mangieri, 1987.

26. Clark, et al., 1984; Empey, 1984; Fox, 1984; Howard & Goethals, 1985; Schwartz, 1984; Shiring & Crawley, 1983; Sykes, 1983b; Tack, 1986; Wimpelberg & King, 1983

27. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Clark, 1984; Tomorrow's teachers, 1986

28. Newspaper and magazine descriptions of the Bridenthal Program include:

AACTE, 1984; American Teacher, 1984; LaFranchi, 1985; Hall, 1984; and, Ingalls, 1984. Additionally, this program has been featured on nationally televised programs such as CBS Sunday Morning, and NBC Nightly News.

29. Names of institutions and persons associated with this program have been fictionalized.

30. For a detailed discussion of each of these components, see Marshall, Sears, Fulton & Otis-Wilborn, 1987.

31. For a discussion of the meta-theoretical assumptions guiding this type of inquiry and the issues in conducting qualitative research in higher education, see Sears, Marshall & Otis-Wilborn, 1986.

32. For a thorough review of the research methdology, design, and analyses, see Sears, Moyer & Marshall, 1986; Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1987a.

33. Cultural capital is the "symbolic property. . .which the schools preserve and distribute. . . .In its very production and dissemination as a public and economic commodity -- as books, films, materials, and so forth -- it is repeatedly filtered through ideological and economic commitments . . .Cultural capital ('good taste,' certain kinds of prior knowledge, abilities and language forms) is unequally distributed throughout society and this is dependent in large part on the division of labor and power in that society" (Apple, 1979:3,8,33). For a further elaboration of this concept, see: Apple & Wexler, 1978; Bernstein, 1975; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Young, 1971.

34. Dean, 1985; Downhower, 1982; Fielstra, 1955; Forell, 1981; Richards, 1960; Wright, 1977

35. For a review of this recruitment process, see Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1988.

36. G. Gallup, 1984; A. Gallup, 1985; 1986

37. For a discussion of commitment to teaching based upon data collected from the Bridenthal Program, see Otis-Wilborn, Sears & Marshall, 1988.

38. Sears, Moyer & Marshall, 1986; Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1987.

39. Marshall, Sears, Fulton & Otis-Wilborn, 1987; Marshall & Moyer, 1987; Sears, Otis-Wilborn & Marshall, 1987

40. Sears, Moyer & Marshall, 1986; Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1987

41. See, for example: Apple & Franklin, 1977; Eisner, 1979.

42. For a review of these programmatic features, see Moyer & Marshall, 1987

43. Data supporting this position are presently being prepared by the authors for publication in their third year program evaluation report.

44. For a discussion about the problems of recruiting minority students into teaching, see: Raizen, 1986; Reed, 1986. Gifford (1985) outlines a proposal to increase the supply of minority teachers.

45. Goodlad, 1984; Mclaughlin, et al., 1986; Metropolitan Life, 1986; Raschke, et al., 1985.

46. For an elaboration of this theme, see: Apple, 1987; Carlson, 1987; Ginsburg, 1987; Giroux, 1981; Grumet, 1981; Shapiro, 1985. Such reforms, as Carlson (1987:306) argues, confront a paradox:

> The system cannot create the conditions most suitable to the pursuit of excellence by teachers and students without giving teachers and students much more control over the schooling process; and there is no assurance that teachers and student will then use their newfound power, or define excellence, in ways that are consistent with corporate and state interests. . . .[Thus] while the system may be humanized somewhat under existing poltical and economic conditions, strong pressures will exist to re-assert top-down bureaucractic control and disempower teachers (along with students) within the schooling process.

47. For an insightful discussion of the use of critical pedagogy in teacher education see, David Kirk (1987). He defines critical pedagogy as one in which:

> teachers act as intelligent practitioners capable of reflective thought and reconstructive action, who are able to take respoinsibility for their own professional development, and who can contribute significantly to the creation of an emancipatory educational process through schooling" (Kirk, 1987:156).

REFERENCES

AACTE, (1984). 1984 Report to the Profession: Data show innovative change. Special Report. Washington, DC: AACTE. ERIC Document No. ED 244 954.

Alexander, L. (1985). Serious about keeping good teachers: Listen to this Governor's ten suggestions. American School Board Journal, 172(1): 33-34.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1983). Educating a profession. (Position Paper 3). Washington, DC: AACTE.

Apple, M. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

—— (1987). Will the social context allow a tomorrow for tomorrow's teachers? Teacher College Record, 88(3): 330-337.

—— & Franklin, B. (1977). Curricular history and social control. In C. Grant (Ed.), Community participation in education, (pp. 176-201). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

—— & Wexler, P. (1978). Cultural capital and educational transmissions. Educational Theory. 28(1):3-13.

Austin, A. (1983). The American freshman. Los Angeles, CA: American Council on Education/University of California at Los Angeles.

Baker, L. (1970). An analysis of some assumed predictors of success in teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. United States International University.

Barger, J., Barger,R. & Reardon,J. (1986). The academic quality of teacher certification graduates and their employment histories. A paper presented at the 1986 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Chicago, Ill. (March 1, 1986).

Barr, R. (1984). New ideas for teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(2): 127-130.

—— (1987). Reform of teacher education and the problem of quality assurance. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5): 45-51.

Bernstein, B. (1977). Class, codes and control Volume 3. (2nd ed). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bethune, S. (1981). Factors related to white females' choice of education as a field of study during college: An analysis of the national longitudinal study of the high school class of 1972. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Book, C. et al. (1985). Comparing academic backgrounds and career aspirations of education and noneducation majors. Research and Evaluation in Teaching Education Program Evaluation Series no. 2. Michigan State University: East Lansing, College of Education.

Borko, H. (1986). Clinical teacher education: The induction years. In J. V. Hoffman & S. A. Edwards (Eds.), Reality and reform in clinical teacher education. (pp. 45-63). New York: Random House.

Borkow, N., & Jordan, K. (1983). The teacher workforce. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. (1977). Reproduction in education, society and culture London: Sage.

Bowles, S. (1970). Towards an education production function. In W. Hansen (Ed.), Education, Income and Human Capital. (pp.11-61) New York: Columbia University Press.

Boyce, A. (1912). Qualities of merit in secondary school teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 3(3):144-157.

Brogdon, R. & Tincher, W. (1986). Higher aptitude high school student's opinion of career choice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Mid South ERA.

Brooks, D. (1987). Teacher induction: A new beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Brophy, J. (1982). Successful teaching strategies for the inner-city child. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(8): 527-530.

Brownlee, G. (1985). The identification of teacher education candidates. In P. J. Burke & R. G. Heideman (Eds.), Career-Long teacher education. (pp.40-61). Springfield: Illinois.

Carlson, D. (1987). Teachers as political actors. Harvard Educational Review, 57(3): 283-307.

---- (1985). Curriculum and the school work culture. In P. Altbach (Ed.), Excellence in Education. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum.

Carpenter, J. (1973). A survey of the criteria for the selection of undergraduate candidates for admission to teacher training. ERIC Document No. ED 070 758.

Chapman, D. (1984). Teacher retention. American Educational Research Journal, 21(3): 645-658.

Clabaugh, G., Feden, P. & Vogel, R. (1984). Revolutionizing teacher education: Training developmentally oriented teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(9): 615-616.

Clark, R., Johnson, R., Kessler, B., & Schultz, K. (1984). Recruiting talent into public school teaching. Journal of Teacher Education. 35(1): 2-4.

Counts, G. (1935). Break the teacher training lockstep. The Social Frontier, 1(9): 6-7.

Cremin, L. (1965). Preface. In M. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher education in America. (pp. vii-viii). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Fort Worth: Christian University Research Fund, 1984.

Dean, H. (1985). Recruiting practices as they relate to the factors which influenced individuals to become industrial arts teachers. Unpublished doctoral disseration. University of Arkansas.

Denton, J. & Smith, N. (1983). Alternative teacher preparation programs: A cost efficient comparison. Research on evaluation program paper and report series no. 86. Northwest Regional Educational Lab. Portland, OR. (July, 1983).

Downhower, S. (1982). Post-high school career progress of students attending Ohio's Martine W. Essex School for the Gifted, 1976-1980: A follow-up study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Ducharme, R. (1970). Selected preservice factors related to success of the beginning teacher. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Lousisana State and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Dupuis, M. (1984). Good sign for education majors. Education, 8(2): 4.

Eisner, E. (1979). The educational imagination. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Emanual, J., Larimore, D. & Sagan, E. (1975). The relation of selected academic program variables to student teaching performance. Contemporary Education, 46(4): 245-248.

Empey, D. (1984). The greatest risk: Who will teach? The Elementary School Journal, 85(2): 167-176.

Evenden, E., Gamble, G., & Blue, H. (1935). Teacher personnel in the United States. In National Survey of the Education of teachers. (Vol. 2) Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1986). The first year of teacher preparation. Journal of Curriculum Studies. 18(3): 239-256.

Feinberg, W. (1985). Fixing the schools: The ideological turn. Issues in Education, 3(2): 113-138.

Feistritzer, C. (1983). The condition of teaching. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

——— (1984). The making of a teacher. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Information.

Fielstra, C. (1955). An analysis of factors influencing the decision to become a teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 48(7): 659-667.

Fisher, R. & Feldman, M. (1985). Some answers about the quality of teacher education students. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(3): 37-40.

Fisher, R. (1984). Education students fare well in Illinois survey. AACTE Briefs, 5(2): 13.

Forell, J. (1981). Identification of factors influencing student choices of secondary vocational education teaching as a career. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nebraska.

Fox, J. (1984). Restructuring the teacher work force to attract the best and the brightest. Journal of Education Finance, 10(2): 214-237.

Frantiani, J. (1979). Prediction of beginning teaching success from personal and program variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Freeman, D., Cusic, P. & Howang, R. (1986). Public response to proposals for raising academic standards in secondary schools. Michigan State University: College of Education.

Gallup, G. (1984). The 16th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(1), 23-38.

Gallup, A. (1985). The 17th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 35-47.

---- (1986). The 18th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(1), 43-59.

---- & Clark, D. (1987). The 19th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 17-30.

Galvez-Hjornivic, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1): 6-11.

Getzels, J. & Jackson, P. (1963). The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (1st. ed.) pp. 506-82. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Gifford, B. (1985). A modest proposal: Increasing the supply of minority teachers. ERIC Document No. 260 027.

Ginsburg, M. (1987). Teacher education and class and gender relations. Educational Foundations, 2(3): 4-36.

Giroux, J. (1981). Ideology, culture and the process of schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grant, G., et al. (1983). The teacher's predicament. Teachers College Record, 84(3): 593-609.

Grumet, M. (1981). Pedagogy for patriarchy. Interchange, 12(2-3): 165-184.

Guilford, J. (1959). Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hankins, B. (1982). Educational plans, career interests, and projected needs of intellectually gifted high school seniors in Mississippi. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Mississippi.

Hanushek, E. (1972). Education and race. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Harper, C. (1939). A century of public teacher education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Hawk, P. & Robards, S. (1987). Statewide teacher induction programs. In D. M. Brooks (Ed.), Teacher induction: A new beginning. (pp. 33-43). Reston, VA: Assoiciation of Teacher Educators.

Hawley, W. (1974). The possibilities of non-bureaucratic organization, in W. Hawley & D. Rogers (Eds.), Improving the quality of urban management. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hellfritzsch, A. (1945). A factor analysis of teacher abilities. Journal of Experimental Education, 14(2): 166-199.

Howard, R. & Goethals, M. (1985). Introducing talented high school students to teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(7): 511-512.

Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1986). The current debate on teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(5): 41-49.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1): 2-5.

Ishler, R. (1984). Requirements for admissions to and graduation from teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(2): 121-122.

Jencks, C., et al., (1972). Inequality. New York: Harper & Row.

Jenkins, H. (1978). The relationship of beginning teachers' scores on the National Teacher Exam and other selected variables to their competency in teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Mississippi State University.

Jones, M. (1956). Analysis of certain aspects of teaching ability. Journal of Experimental Education, 25(2): 153-181.

Joseph, P. & Green, N. (1986). Perceptions on reasons for becoming teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6): 28-33.

Kemper, R. & Mangieri, J. (1987). America's future teaching force: Predictions and recommendations. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(5): 393-395.

Kerr, D. (1983). Teaching competence and teacher education in the United States. Teachers College Record, 84(3): 525-552.

Kester, R. & Marockie, M. (1987). Local induction programs. In D. M. Brooks (Ed.), Teacher induction: A new beginning. (pp.25-31). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Kirk, D. (1986). Beyond the limits of theoretical discourse in teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(2): 155-167.

Knight, E. & Hall, C. (1951). Reading in american educational history. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Kottkamp, R., Provenzo, E. & Cohn, M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes 1964-1984. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(8): 559-567.

Krockover, G., Mortlock, H. & Johnson, B. (1987). Comparing success predictors and common core course performance. Action in Teacher Education, 9(1): 61-65.

La Duke, D. (1945). The measurement of teaching ability. Journal of Experimental Education, 14(1): 75-100.

Laman, A. & Reeves, D. (1983). Admission to teacher education programs: The status and trends. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1): 2-4.

——— (1982). A survey of criteria for admitting students to teacher education programs. Western Kentucky University.

Lanier, J. & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (pp. 527-569). New York: MacMillian.

Loadman, W. (1983). Implementation and selected data findings on the Ohio State University Information System. Paper presented at the Evaluation Network Conference, Chicago.

Lydenberg, S., Marlin, A., & Strub, S. (1986). Rating America's corporate conscience. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Maguire, J. (1966). Factors in undergraduate teacher education relating to success in teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Florida State University.

Mark, J. & Anderson, B. (1985). Teacher survival rates in St. Louis, 1969-1982. American Educational Research Journal, 22(3): 413-421.

Marshall, J., Sears, T., Fulton, T., Otis-Wilborn, A. (1987). The [Bridenthal] Internship in teaching program: Operationalizing teacher education reform. Teacher Education, 1(2): 22-29

———, & Moyer, P. (1987). Building strong foundations for teacher-leaders: The [Bridenthal] Internship in Teaching project's first year curriculum. Teaching Education, 1(2): 38-41

———, Sears, J., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1987). A longitudinal study of a demonstration project related to the recruitment, preparation and retention of hightly qualified persons for the teaching profession: The [Bridenthal] Interns — The second year. ERIC Document No. 282 842.

——, Sears, J., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1988). The recruitment and induction of "quality" students into teacher education: A case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Mason, W. (1966). The beginning teacher: Status and career orientations. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Massey H., & Vineyard, E. (1958). Relationship between scholarship and first year teaching success. Journal of Teacher Education, 9(3): 297-301.

McLaughlin, M., et al., (1986). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan. 67(6): 420-425.

Medlin, D. (1984). Teacher training and the improvement of public education. American Education, 20(6): 5-7.

Metropolitan Life (1986). Former teachers in America. American Educator, 10(2): 34-39, 48.

Metz, A., & Crane, J. (1980). New teachers on the job market. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Morsh, J. & Wilder, E. (1954). Identifying the effective instructor: A review of the quantitative studies, 1900-1952. USAF Personnel Training Research Center, Research Bulletin.

Murnane, R. (1983). Understanding the source of teaching competence: Choices, skills and the limits of training (Response to Donna Kerr). Teachers College Record, 84(3): 564-569.

The National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

National Education Association, (1960). The teacher shortage analyzed. New Research Bulletin, (October): 68-74.

Nelli, E. (1984). A research-based response to allegations that education students are academically inferior. Action in Teacher Education, 6(3): 73-80.

Nelli, E. (1981). Five myths in need of reality. Action in Teacher Education, 3(4): 1-6.

Nelson, H. (1985). New perspectives on the teacher quality debate. Journal of Education Research, 78(31): 133-140.

Odell, S. (1987). Teacher induction: Rationalize and issue. In D. M. Brooks (Ed.), Teacher induction: A new beginning. (pp. 69-80). Reston, VA. Association of Teacher Educators.

Otis-Wilborn, A., Sears, J., & Marshall, J. (1987) Recruitment and retention: Important issues for special educators. Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Conference. Arlington, VA (November, 1987). Co-author.

——— (1988). Developing and enhancing commitment to careers of low or moderate status within postsecondary education: The case of teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Pavalko, R. (1970). Recruitment to teaching: Patterns of selection and retention. Sociology of Education, 43(3): 340-355

Perry, N. (1981). New teachers: Do the best get hired? Phi Delta Kappan, 63(2): 113-114.

Pigge, F. (1985). Teacher education graduates: Comparison of those who teach and do not teach. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(4): 27-28.

Piper, M. & O'Sullivan, P. (1981). The national teacher examination: Can it predict classroom performance? Phi Delta Kappan, 62(1): 401.

Pratt, D. (1986). Predicting career success in training. Action in Teacher Education, 8(4): 25-33.

Pugach, M. & Raths, J. (1983). Testing teachers: Analysis and recommendations. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1): 37-43.

Quirk, T., Witten, B. & Weinberg, S. (1973). Review of studies of the concurrent and predictive validity of the National Teacher Examinations. Review of Educational Research, 43(1): 89-113.

Raizen, S. (1986). Strategies to increase teacher supply and quality. Teacher Education Quarterly, 13(4): 22-30.

Raschke, D., et al., (1985). Teacher stress. Elementary School Journal, 85(4): 559-564.

Reagan, B. (1983). Quality assurance in education: Borrowing a lesson from business. American Education, (19)4: 19-22.

Reed, B. (1976). Selection of promising high school graduates as future teachers: An experiment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York University.

Reed, D. (1986). Wanted: Black teacher education students. Action in Teacher Education, 8(): 31-36

Richards, R. (1960). Prospective students' attitudes toward teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 11(): 375-380.

Riccobono, L. (1981). The national longitudinal study: Base year 1972 through fourth follow-up 1979. Data File Users Manual. Research Triangle Park, NC: Center for Educational Reseach.

Roberson, S., Keith, T. & Page, E. (1983). Now who aspires to teach? Educational Researcher, 12(6): 13-21.

Rostker, L. (1945). The measurement of teaching ability. Journal of Experimental Education, 14(1): 6-51.

Ryans, D. (1960). Characteristics of teachers. Washington, DC: American Council of Education.

Sacks, S. & Brady, (1985). Who teaches the city's children? A study of New York City's first-year teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Sanders, H. (1981). Risk and career choice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. City University of New York.

Scannell, D. (1984). The extended teacher education program at the University of Kansas. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(2): 130-133.

Schalock, H. (1987). The central in teacher warranties: Quality assurance for what? Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5): 52-58.

Schalock, M. (1987). Teacher productivity: What is it? How might it be measured? Can it be measured? Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5): 59-62.

Schlechty, P. & Crowell, D. (1985). Staff development and social improvement: A social district examines its potential for excellence. Washington, D.C.: National Insititute of Education.

---- & Vance, V. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(1): 106-112.

---- (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4): 469-487.

Schwartz, H. (1984). Recruitment, selection, retention and graduation of teacher education candidates. Seminar paper presented at a Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. San Francisco, CA. ERIC Document No. 250 308.

Sears, J. (1984). A critical ethnography of teacher education programs at [Founders] University: An inquiry into the perceptions of students and faculty regarding quality and effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University.

---- (1987). Credibility in teacher education: Dilemmas of students, faculty and administrators at Founders University. Unpublished manuscript.

----, Marshall, J. & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1986). Conducting qualitative research in higher education. Paper presented at the First International Conference on the First Year Experience. Newcastle upon Tyne, England. ERIC Document No. 272 107.

----, Moyer, P., & Marshall, J. (1986). A longitudinal study of a demonstration project related to the recruitment, preparation and retention of hightly qualified persons for the teaching profession: The [Bridenthal] Interns — The first year. ERIC Document No. 272 454.

----, Otis-Wilborn, A., & Marshall, J. (1987). Investigating model teacher education reform. Paper presented at the Mid-Western Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

Shank, K. (1978). Nationwide survey of practices in selection and retention of teacher education candidats. ERIC Document No. ED 167 539.

Shanker, A. (1987). Tomorrow's teachers. Teachers College Record, 88(3): 423-429.

Shapiro, H. (1985). Capitalism at risk: The political economy of the educational reports of 1983. Educational Theory, 35(1): 57-72.

Shim, C. (1965). A study of the cumulative effect of four teacher characteristics on the achievement of elementary school pupils. Journal of Educational Research, 59(1): 33-34.

Shiring, J., & Crawley, F. (1983). Bringing honor to secondary teacher preparation programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(4): 18-20.

Shor, I. (1986). Equality is excellence: Transforming teacher education and the learning process. Harvard Educational Review, 56(4): 406-426.

Siegel, W. (1969). A study of the relationship between selected undergraduate academic achievement variables and teaching success. Washington State University.

Silverston, B. (1984). Classroom effectiveness and admissions criteria for intern teachers: An empirical study.

Smith, R. (1986). A study of the difference in the satisfaction with teaching work between high academic and low academic ability teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Utah.

Sullivan, J. (1981). Women's career aspirations: A national survey of traditional and non-traditional aspirations of college freshmen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Florida State University.

Summers, A., & Wolfe, B. (1975). When school resources help learning? Efficiency and equity in Philadelphia Public Schools. American Economics Review, 67(4): 639-652.

Sykes, G. (1983a). Teacher preparation and the teacher workforce: Problems and prospects for the 80s. American Education, 19(2): 23-30.

---- (1983b). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets. In L. Schulman (Ed.), Handbook of Teaching and Policy. (pp.). New York: Longman.

Tack, M. (1986). Recruiting the superior student for the teaching profession. Contemporary Education, 57(2): 75-79.

Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools, (1983). Meeting the need for quality: Action in the South. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1983.

Taylor, G. & Miller, P. (1985). Professional course work and the practicum: Do good students make good teachers? Canadian Journal of Education, 10(2): 105-120.

Thacker, J. (1965). A study of the relationship between principals estimates of teaching efficiency and scores on national teacher examinations, academic averages, and supervisor's estimates of potential for selected teachers in North Carolina. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Tiller, M. (1981). Identifying effective prospective elementary teachers with piagetian cognitive level, GPA and ACT. Northeast Louisiana University.

Tomorrow's teachers. (1986). East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

U.S. News & World Report (1983). What's wrong with our teachers? 94(6): 37-40.

Vance, V. & Schlechty, P. (1982). The distribution of academic ability in the teaching force: Policy implications. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(1): 22-27.

Villeme, M. & Hall, B. (1980). Preservice grades don't predict career success in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 62(2): 145.

—— (1985). Higher ability teachers: How do they differ from lower ability teachers in their use of selected teaching practices. Action in Teacher Education, 20(3): 27-30.

Wahlstrom, M. & Daley, R. (1979). On the selection of teacher candidates: A systematic search for criteria. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Education.

Warren, D. (1986). Learning from experience: History and teacher education. Educational Researcher, 14(10): 5-12.

Washburne, C. & Heil, L. (1960). What characteristics of teacher affect children's growth? School Review, 68(4): 420-428.

Weaver, W. (1978). Educators in supply and demand: Effects on quality. School Review, 86(3): 552-593.

—— (1979). In search of quality: The need for talent in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 61(1): 29-32.

—— (1981). The talent pool in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(2):32-36.

—— (1983). America's teacher quality problem: Alternatives for reform. New York: Praeger.

——— (1984). Solving the problem of teacher quality, part I. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(2): 108-115.

Wimpelberg, R. & King, J. (1983). Rethinking teacher recruitment. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1): 5-8.

Wisniewski, R. (1986). Alternative programs and the reform of teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2): 37-44.

Wood, K. (1978). What motivates students to teach? Journal of Teacher Education, 16(1): 48-50.

Wright, B. (1977). Our reason for teaching. Theory into Practice, 16(4): 225-230.

Young, M. (1971). Knowledge and control. London: Tavistock.